

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
REV. LOUIS FITZGERALD BENSON, D. D.
BEQUEATHED BY HIM TO
THE LIBRARY OF
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division

Section

SCC
10139
v. 211



A HISTORY
OF THE
HOLY EASTERN CHURCH.

The Patriarchate of Alexandria.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION,
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE HOLY
EASTERN CHURCH.

IN THREE BOOKS.

Book I.—Its Geography.

„ II.—Its Liturgies and Ecclesiology.

„ III.—Its Controversies on the Filioque, Azymes, and
Transubstantiation.



A HISTORY
OF THE
HOLY EASTERN CHURCH.

The Patriarchate of Alexandria.

BY THE
REV. JOHN MASON NEALE, M.A.,
Warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead.

VOLUME I.

LONDON:
JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET.
OXFORD: J. H. PARKER.
CAMBRIDGE: MACMILLAN AND CO.

MDCCCXLVII.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY JOSEPH MASTERS,
ALDERSGATE STREET.

TO HIS HOLINESS

A R T E M I U S,

BY DIVINE MERCY

POPE AND PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA,

LIBYA, PENTAPOLIS, AND ALL THE PREACHING OF S. MARK,

AND ECUMENICAL JUDGE,

This History of the Church of S. Athanasius

IS, WITH ALL HUMILITY,

INSCRIBED.



P R E F A C E .

1. THE sources whence a History of the Church of Alexandria is to be derived, are so many and so various, and some of them so little known, that it will be perhaps useful to particularize them. They naturally divide themselves into two branches; those which treat of the whole, and those which only embrace a portion, of Alexandrian History.

2. There are four works which relate the Annals of the Egyptian Church from the preaching of S. Mark to the time at which their respective authors lived; those of Le Quien, Renaudot, Sollerius, and Wansleb.

3. The treatise *De Patriarchatu Alexandrino* of the learned Dominican Father, Michael Le Quien, is contained in the Second Volume of his *Oriens Christianus*, pp. 329—368. The plan of this work is well known. It commences with a general sketch of the rise, progress, rights, privileges, and character of the Church of Alexandria: of the heresies by which it has been infested, and the duties which were claimed from it by the Church Catholic. It proceeds to a list of the Patriarchs, both heretical and Melchite; giving, under each, a slight and brief review of his actions. It concludes with a catalogue of all the Sees which are known to have been its suffragans; and a list under each,

of all the Prelates who are recorded as having filled that particular See. The patient industry, accuracy, fairness, and moderation of this work are above praise: it did not, however, receive the last touches of its author; and occasionally self-contradictions may be discovered in it. It is evident also from many accidental hints that the writer was not acquainted with Arabic; a circumstance which must considerably detract from the worth of such a history. Nevertheless, it is very valuable as an outline which may be filled up from other sources; and it is the only complete history which we possess of the Catholic Church of Alexandria.

Renaudot.

4. Very different is the character of the next work I have to mention; the "History of the Jacobite Patriarchs of Alexandria," written by the learned Eusebe Renaudot. It extends from the time of S. Mark to the year 1703; but, after the great schism, leaving the Catholic succession of Patriarchs, it confines itself to the heretical successors of Dioscorus. It is extracted principally from the "Patriarchal History;" that is to say, the history of the Jacobite Patriarchs commenced by Severus, Bishop of Aschumin, and carried on by Michael of Tanis, Mauhoub the son of Mansour, Mark the son of Zaraa, and others, as far as the conclusion of the Patriarchate of Cyril the son of Laklak; that is to say, down to the year 1243. The immense learning of Renaudot, his acquaintance with nearly thirty languages, his devotion to Eastern literature, and the advantage which he enjoyed in being able to consult the unrivalled collection of Manuscripts in the King's Library at Paris, have rendered his work, so far as it goes, more complete than probably any other scholar could have made it. Besides his translations from the historians whom I have just mentioned, and whose works yet remain manuscript, he has enriched his history from other writers, both such had been already printed in his time, as Eutychius and Elnacinus, and those which have been given to the world since, as is the case with Makrizi. His pages also embrace very copious accounts of the succession of Caliphs, and of the rise and fall of the various Mahometan Dynasties; and occasionally refer to the doings or sufferings of the Catholic Patriarchs. But with all these merits, the work has also all the faults of Renaudot; it is insufferably long, tedious and confused; learning is wasted

in the discussion of points known to all the world; and the thread of the history broken and taken up again in the most perplexing manner imaginable. In this place we may also mention the *Discursus* of the same author *de Patriarcha Alexandrino*, pp. 365—466 of his Collection of Oriental Liturgies.

5. The next work I shall mention is that of Wansleb, a ^{Wansleb.} Dominican Missionary in Egypt. It also relates entirely to the Jacobite succession; and had the merit of being the first work in which their history was introduced to Europe. It is divided into seven parts. The first treats of the constitution of the Jacobite Church; the second of its customs and present state; the third of its belief; the fourth of its ceremonies; the fifth of its canons: the sixth gives a catalogue of its Patriarchs; and the seventh of its principal writers. The small size of this volume, its continual inaccuracies, and the scanty information which it furnishes on any subject, renders it nearly useless, except for occasional reference. The catalogue of Patriarchs is translated from the Arabic of Abu'lberkat; with a continuation by later hands in the manuscript which Wansleb consulted.

6. The fourth history is the "Chronological Series of ^{Sollerius.} Alexandrian Patriarchs," written by the Jesuit, John Baptist Sollerius; and prefixed to the fifth volume of June, in the Bollandist Acts of the Saints. This treatise, which fills a hundred and sixty closely printed folio pages, is little more than an amplification of the work of Wansleb. Sollerius, besides his general acquaintance with Ecclesiastical history, had little to fit him for the task; he was not acquainted with the Eastern languages; he had access to no manuscripts; nor had he any private sources of information, except a communication from the Jesuit Bernati, then a missionary in Ethiopia. The consequence is that he relies too much on the comparatively worthless materials which were in his possession; he is anxious to reconcile dates with each other, which are none of them consistent with truth; and he endeavours to settle minute points of chronology in times when an approximation to accuracy is all that can be hoped for. His treatise does not pretend to be a history, and, except for its dates, adds little to our know-

ledge of the Alexandrian Church. Of the Catholic Patriarchs this writer takes hardly any notice.

Hierotheus,
late Patri-
arch of
Alexandria.

7. Besides the works which I have mentioned, the latest of which only comes down to the year 1730, I have had two other sources of information. I applied in the spring of 1844 to His late Holiness, Hierotheus, then Catholic Patriarch of Alexandria, for the history of his predecessors since the beginning of the eighteenth century; and the results of that inquiry will be found in their proper place. I also obtained, through the kindness of a Jacobite Priest, a complete list of the Patriarchs of that sect from Dioscorus to Peter VII., who now fills that post; and from the same quarter I also received some interesting information as to the present state of the Jacobites in Egypt.

Euty chius.

8. I come now to speak of those authors who have treated of a part of the period which this work embraces. The first of these is Euty chius. Of his history of the Catholic Patriarchs of Alexandria I have spoken in treating of his own Patriarchate; and it is needless therefore to say anything further here, than that I believe that nothing which he relates of interest down to the time when his annals terminate, namely the year 938, will be found to have been omitted in this work. Without professing any very great obligations to him, I may yet observe that some of the facts which he relates in the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, are mentioned only by himself.

Elmacinus.

9. The next author whom I shall name is the Jacobite Elmacinus, as translated and edited by Erpenius. His Saracenic History only incidentally mentions the Jacobite Patriarchs of Alexandria; but his accuracy and truth stand very high: and when he fixes a date, his testimony is to be received beyond that of any other author. I have in the history already given his character; and need therefore say nothing more of him here.

Makrizi.

10. I will next mention the Mahometan Makrizi, who, while he draws great part of his information from Elmacinus, nevertheless adds considerably to it, and is highly to be commended for his accuracy and fairness. Of his work, which extends to the year 1327, I have also spoken in the proper place.

11. The "History of Dynasties," written by Abu'lpharaj, Abu'lpharaj. better known by his name of Gregory Bar-Hebræus, and translated and edited by Pococke, is also not without its value as a contribution to Alexandrian History. We are frequently indebted to it for some hint as to the actions of the Caliphs, which may serve to clear up points left in the dark by Elmacinus or Makrizi.

12. I now come to speak of the Ethiopic Church. The charac- Ludolph. ter of Ludolph's History, and Commentary on his History, is too well known to need any observations here. It is only wonderful that a man possessing an acquaintance with the Ethiopic language, which has been attained by no other European before or since his time, should have added so little to our knowledge of that country. The facts which are to be gleaned from this vast folio lie scattered thinly among the heap of rubbish with which they are surrounded; and his ignorance of everything but the language itself, his absurd confidence in some worthless Ethiopic compositions, and his blind prejudice, manifest themselves throughout.

13. The "Church History of Ethiopia" of Dr. Michael Michael Geddes. Geddes is one of the most despicable compositions which was ever inflicted on the public. His only qualification for historian of that country was his knowledge of Portuguese, and a tolerable acquaintance with the various works in which the proceedings of the missionaries in that country are related. His prejudice against everything connected with Rome is such, that nothing can be taken upon his testimony: his principal value lies in his pointing out original sources of information. He had been Chaplain to the British Factory at Lisbon; and was under the patronage of Bishop Burnet.

14. A much fairer work is the "History of Christianity in La Croze. Ethiopia," written by the celebrated La Croze. It does not pretend to the same fulness as Geddes, and is derived from nearly the same sources: but, although a Protestant, the author is unable, like the English Divine, to see nothing but excellence in the Ethiopian, or faults in the Roman, Church.

15. The first book of this History extends from the Foundation First Book. of the Church of Alexandria to the rise of the Nestorian heresy. Besides the ordinary Church historians, such as Eusebius,

Sozomen, and Socrates, the works of S. Athanasius are of course my chief authority. But I am also bound to express my obligation to the very able Life of S. Dionysius by Byæus the Bollandist; to the Propaganda edition of the works of the same Father; to the Benedictine Life of S. Athanasius, and to Tillemont's Annals of that Patriarch. In a less degree, De la Rue's Life of Origen and Huet's Origeniana have been of service to these pages.

Second
Book.

16. The second book comprises the controversy on the Incarnation, from the first outbreak of Nestorius, to the deposition of Dioscorus. Here, of course, I am principally indebted to the works of S. Cyril; to Tillemont's Life of that Father; to Garnier's edition of Marius Mercator; to the two editions of S. Leo's works,—the one by Cacciari, the other by the Ballerini: and to the very accurate chronological researches of Pagi.

Third Book.

17. The third book comprises the history of the Alexandrian Church, from the commencement of the great schism to the subjection of both Catholic and Jacobite Communions to the arms of the Caliphs. Here we begin to derive assistance from the works of Eutychius, Elmacinus, Makrizi, and Severus: Liberatus, Evagrius, and the Chronicon of Victor are also our guides. The Patriarchate of S. John the Almoner is indebted to the labours of Stilling the Bollandist in the fourth volume of September in the Acts of the Saints;—and the Epistles of S. Gregory throw some light on the Alexandrian annals of that period. To the Life of S. John the Almoner, in the second volume of the Bollandist January, I am less indebted.

Fourth
Book

18. In the fourth book, which extends from the Conquest of Amrou to the Vizirate of Saladin, Severus and his continuers are my chief guides. Of the Catholic Church, when Eutychius deserts us, we know nothing more than can be picked up by incidental notices of the Byzantine historians. These are generally few and far between; with the exception of a tolerably detailed account of the proceedings of Athanasius II. afforded in the prolix pages of George Pachymeres. For the Crusades, so far as they affected Egypt, I have depended principally on Wilken's Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, and the authors alleged by him. I have also derived, in Jacobite history generally, very

important assistance from the Chronicle of Gregory Bar-Hebræus, as epitomized in the second volume of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Asseman.

19. The fifth book embraces the period between the elevation of Saladin and the first interference of the Portuguese in Ethiopia. Here we are worse off for materials than at any other period. Its most important event is the great confessional controversy,—and the remarkable history of Mark the son of Kunbar. But from A.D. 1243, when the *Patriarchal History* ends, to 1490, I am compelled to confess that Alexandrian annals are hardly more than catalogues of names. Fifth Book.

20. The sixth book comprises the remainder of my task, and divides itself into two distinct portions. The first of these is the rise, progress, and decline of Roman Influence in Ethiopia. Here, besides Geddes, La Croze, and Ludolph, we have the advantage of Bruce's very clear Abyssinian history; and the original authorities are Alvarez, Tellez, and the account of the Patriarch João Bermudez; which latter is translated in Purchas's Pilgrimage, and thence retranslated by La Croze. The other subject is the attempt made, in the seventeenth century, to engraft Calvinism in the Oriental Church; and as this part of history is extremely important, and very little known, I have preferred rather to overstep the bounds I proposed to myself than to treat it cursorily. My authorities, on the Roman side, are, principally, the *Perpetuité de la Foy*, and the *Defense de la Perpetuité*; the *Creance de l'Eglise Orientale* of Simon; the *De Consensu* of Leo Allatius; and the incidental notices of Le Quien and Renaudot. On the Oriental side,—the Councils of Constantinople, Jassy, and Bethlehem, as given in Labbe; the History of the Russian Church by Mouravieff; the Chronicon of Philip of Cyprus: to which I may add the "Present State of the Greek Church" of Ricaut,—a very fair writer. On the Calvinistic side,—Crusius's *Turco-Græcia*; Claude's Reply to the *Perpetuité*, and his *Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, which is a Reply to the *Defense*; Aymon's Memoirs of the Greek Church; Smith's *Account of the Greek Church*, both in English and Latin: to which may be added Dr. Covell's account of the same Church. I also applied to the Public Library at Geneva, for permission to copy all the hitherto unpublished letters of Cyril Sixth Book.

Lucar's preserved in that Library ; and among these the reader will find a very important and hitherto unprinted one, to the Archbishop De Dominis, on the publication of his work *De Republicâ Christianâ*. To all these I must add, the Life of Cyril Lucar from the pen of Dr. Beaven, which appeared in several numbers of the *British Magazine*.

21. I had intended to affix an excursus in defence of the very early chronology adopted in the first Section : want of space has obliged me to forbear. A vindication of it may, however, be found in the Bollandist Life of S. Peter under the 29th of June. For the same reason, I have been obliged to omit the list of Egyptian martyrs in the Tenth Persecution, to which reference is made at its conclusion.

22. Two remarks connected with orthography may not be out of place. The first is, that I have adopted the two different spellings, Diœcese and Diocese, to signify two different things. By the former I mean its old sense, the jurisdiction of an Exarch or Patriarch, as the Diœcese of Ephesus, the Diœcese of Alexandria : by the latter, that of a Bishop. Fleury, in like manner, speaks of *le* and *la* Diocese. The other is, that I have followed the Oriental method of spelling names, after the Mahometan invasion. Thus, Chail is written for Michael ; Chenouda for Sanutius : Abdel-Messiah for Christodulus. I have not done so, however, where the name is that of one well known as an author. Thus, I do not refer to Said Ebn Batric, but to Euty chius.

23. I have now to express my obligations for the valuable assistance I have received in this work. I desire gratefully to commemorate the kindness of His late Holiness, Hierotheus, to whom I had hoped to inscribe the History of his Church. My thanks are also especially due to the Rev. Edmund Winder, British Chaplain at Alexandria, for the indefatigable kindness with which he has collected and transmitted to me information ; to Alfred S. Walne, Esq., Her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Cairo, who was so obliging as to wait on the Patriarch with the queries I had transmitted to him ; and to the Vicar of the Jacobite Patriarch at Alexandria, (whose name I regret not to know,) who furnished me with a great deal of valuable information as to the state of that Communion.

But, in a most especial manner, my warmest thanks are due to the Rev. W. H. Mill, D.D., late Principal of Bishop's College, who, with the greatest kindness, gave me the advantage of his remarks on most of the sheets, as they passed through the press; and to whom I am indebted for several corrections, and for some important references to sources of information with which I was previously unacquainted. Of him I may well say, as Davies of Bentley, *Quodcunque de istis lucubrationibus feretur judicium, illius certe rectissimo stant talo; et ut quæ olim edidit doctiores omnes legunt avidissime, ita quæ apud se premit, expectant cupidissime*. I have also to express my obligations to my friend the Rev. B. Webb, M.A., who finally read through most of the sheets of this history before they were struck off; a work of which he only who has tried it can calculate the trouble or the use.

I am indebted also to D. José Xavier Cerveira e Sousa, Bishop of Funchal and Arguim, for the kindness with which he furnished me with any book which was contained in his Episcopal Library: and to Canon Antonio Pestana, Rector of the Seminary in Funchal, for the obliging manner in which he put the valuable library of that institution completely at my disposal. Portuguese libraries are especially valuable to a historian of the Alexandrian Church: for the works of Tellez and Alvarez are not to be procured in England. Lastly, I would thank M. Chastel, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Librarian of the public library at Geneva, for the great pains which he took in procuring the transcription of Cyril Lucar's letters; and M. Grivel, for the success with which he decyphered them. They are written in a mixture of bad Latin, bad Italian, and (occasionally) bad Greek: and the handwriting is as bad as the language.

I trust that, whatever judgment may be formed of this history, while its deficiencies are noted, its difficulties will also be remembered. If the chronology shall sometimes appear unsatisfactory, it is no shame to fail where Renaudot, Le Quien, and Sollerius are often egregiously wrong. If I appear sometimes to compress a century into comparatively *few* pages, it is a century to which, as connected with Alexandria, Baronius and Fleury do not devote *one*.

I have reserved, for my Introduction to the study of the History of the Oriental Church, some remarks which it seems right to make on the spirit in which such a book should be written. The historian should write, not as a member of the Roman, not as a member of the English, Church; but, as far as may be, with Oriental views, feelings, and even, perhaps, prepossessions. Mouravieff's history is a perfect example in its kind. It was intended that this Introduction should have been prefixed to the present volumes. But it swelled to a size which precluded the possibility of that arrangement; and has been also kept back for valuable information which I hope to receive from Constantinople and Damascus.

SACKVILLE COLLEGE,

EAST GRINSTED.

S. Mark's Day, 1847.

CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME I.

BOOK I.

FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA TO THE RISE
OF NESTORIANISM.

	Page.
SECTION I. The Foundation of the Church	3
II. The Foundation of the Church	12
III. Origen	19
IV. The Octapla	31
V. The Decian Persecution and its results	39
VI. The Millenarian Controversy	55
VII. Question of Re-Baptism	58
VIII. Valerian persecutes the Church	65
IX. Rise of the Sabellian Heresy	69
X. War, Famine, and Plague in Alexandria	76
XI. End of S. Dionysius	80
XII. S. Maximus and S. Theonas	85
XIII. Persecution of Diocletian	90
XIV. S. Antony and the Rise of Monasticism	106
XV. The Arian Heresy	113
XIV. The Great and Œcumenical Council of Nicæa	137
XVII. Conversion of Ethiopia	152
XVIII. Athanasius falsely accused concerning Ischyra and Arsenius	157
XIX. First Exile of S. Athanasius	169
XX. Egyptian Monasticism	176
XXI. Second Exile and Return of S. Athanasius	180
XXII. Third Exile of S. Athanasius	188
XXIII. Fourth and Fifth Exiles of S. Athanasius: his Return and Death	195
XXIV. Pontificate of Peter	207

	Page.
SECT. XXV. Pontificate of Timothy	208
XXVI. Destruction of the Temple of Serapis: Theophilus at Constantinople	210
XXVII. The Early Pontificate of S. Cyril	225

BOOK II.

FROM THE RISE OF THE NESTORIAN HERESY TO THE DEPOSITION OF
DIOSCORUS, AND THE GREAT SCHISM.

SECTION I. Nestorius preaches and defends his Heresy	233
II. The Œcumenical Council of Ephesus	256
III. Reconciliation of Antioch with Alexandria	270
IV. The Rise and Progress of Eutychianism	278
V. The "Robbers' Meeting" at Ephesus	290
VI. The Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon	299

BOOK I.

FROM THE

FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA,

CIRCA A.D. 40,

TO THE RISE OF NESTORIANISM,

A.D. 428.

Πρώτον μὲν γὰρ πάντα δεύτερα ποιεῖσθαι τῆς ἀληθείας τὸν συγγραφέα προσήκει· ἔπειτα δὲ τὸ δόγμα τῆς καθόλου Ἐκκλησίας γνησιώτατον ὅτι μάλιστα φανεῖται, πολλάκις μὲν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς τῶν ἐνάντια δοξαζόντων δοκιμασθέν· οἷα ἐκ Θεόθεν τὸ κρατεῖν λαχόν, αὐθις εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπανελθὼν δύναμιν, καὶ πάσας τὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰ πλήθη πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν ἀληθειάν ἐπισπασάμενον.—Τρέπομαι ἐκ τῆς ἀφῆγησιν τῶν πραγμάτων, συννεργὸν καὶ ἔλεων τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλεσάμενος.

SOZOMEN. PROLOG.

THE

Patriarchate of Alexandria.

SECTION I.

It is the constant and unvarying tradition of both the East¹ and the West, that S. Mark the Evangelist was the founder of the Church of Alexandria. The history, however, of his labours in Libya, Pentapolis, and Egypt, is involved in considerable obscurity: a circumstance in which there is nothing to excite surprise, nor to weaken our belief in the truth of the general statement. If the rise of the Church in such a city as Rome, which has always, since primitive times, been under Christian government, and always retained the same ecclesiastical language, is, in a great degree, unknown to us, and if the succession of its Bishops is implicated in historical difficulties, much more may we expect the case to be so in one which, like Alexandria, has been for many ages subject to Mahometan tyranny, and where the change of language has introduced many errors into its historical records.

The Church of Alexandria, though its early history is obscure,

though its early history is obscure,

That, however, S. Mark the Evangelist was not the same with Mark, the nephew of S. Barnabas, can hardly, notwithstanding the ingenious arguments of several learned men, be now doubted: and by considering the two as distinct personages, we are

founded by S. Mark;

¹ Eusebius, H. E. ii. 16.

enabled to reconcile conflicting statements, the authors of which appear equally worthy of credit.¹

Yet, though antiquity agrees in bestowing on S. Mark the title of the Apostle of Egypt, we are not compelled to suppose that the faith had not previously been preached in that country, even did it appear that his mission were postponed as late as A.D. 50. There were dwellers "in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene,"² who were present at Jerusalem at the outpouring of the HOLY GHOST on the day of Pentecost, some of whom were probably converted by S. Peter's sermon. The Eunuch of Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians, that is, of the Abyssinians, must, on his return to his own country, have passed through Egypt. Simon, who bore the Cross, was a native of Cyrene, and his sons, Alexander and Rufus, were evidently persons well known in the Church: and it is remarkable, and affords an argument in favour of the tradition we have been narrating, that S. Mark, who, from his connexion with Cyrene, would have been likely to be acquainted with the principal persons among its inhabitants, should alone of the Evangelists have particularized the family of Simon the Cyrenian. Again, among the prophets and teachers at Antioch whom the HOLY

yet others
might have
preached in
Egypt before
him;

¹ The question of the identity of S. Mark with the nephew of Barnabas, has been much and warmly disputed. Its decision will depend, in great part, on the year assigned for the Martyrdom of the Evangelist. The learned dissertation of Sollerius, prefixed to the fifth volume of the Bollandine June, seems, notwithstanding the opposite sentiments of Henschenius, in the third volume of April, and of Stilling in the seventh volume of September, to have proved the correctness of the chronology of Eusebius, to which we shall presently have occasion to refer: and to have made it extremely probable that the Evangelist's mission dates from A.D. 37. If, therefore, S. Mark founded the Church of Alexandria about A.D. 40, whereas John Mark was with SS. Paul and Barnabas in A.D. 43 or 44;

if the former were some years in Egypt, and the latter were in Cyprus at the death of S. Barnabas,—as his Acts testify,—in A.D. 51; if the former suffered in A.D. 62, and the latter were with S. Paul at Rome in A.D. 62 or 63 (Philemon 24) nay, even as late as A.D. 65 were summoned by him (2 Timothy iv. 11); it follows evidently, that the two must be different persons. Stilling, however, has shewn, in opposition to Cotelierius, that John Mark is identical with Mark, the nephew of Barnabas. His other arguments appear to us unworthy of his great learning; he confines himself principally to replying to Tillemont, an easier antagonist than Sollerius, because he allows the Evangelist to have lived until A.D. 68.

² Acts ii. 10.

SPIRIT commanded to lay hands on S. Barnabas and S. Paul,¹ we meet with the name of Lucius, of Cyrene. He was probably one of those men of Cyrene, whom the sacred historian mentions before, as the first after S. Peter² to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. It is hardly likely that so many natives of Egypt should, in their labours for the sake of CHRIST, have entirely neglected their own country.

There is a celebrated passage in Philo Judæus, in which he mentions the Therapeutæ, who inhabited the mountain and valley of Nitria, on the western side of the Nile. It has been much disputed who these men were: but we may be content to believe with all the early writers, among whom is Eusebius,³ that they were Christians. Thus it will appear that the Gospel had already been proclaimed in more than one province of Egypt, when S. Mark arrived at Alexandria.

Yet this circumstance by no means forbids us to regard him as the founder of that Church, nor deprives the city of a title in which it gloried, THE EVANGELICAL SEE. There were many Christians both at Antioch and at Rome before S. Peter set foot in either place; yet antiquity always considered⁴ him as the founder of the Churches in each. Again, S. Paul had not only himself dwelt at Ephesus, but had ordained S. Timothy first Bishop of that See; and yet that Church acknowledges S. John the Evangelist as its founder. So that the received belief with respect to S. Mark does not invalidate another tradition, that S. Simon the Canaanite was the first to proclaim the Gospel in Egypt.

as was the case in other instances.

For some time after the day of Pentecost, the Evangelist⁵ is said to have preached in Jerusalem and the neighbouring

¹ Acts xiii. 1.

² Acts xi. 19.

³ H. E. ii. 17. Scaliger will have it that they were Essenes; Valesius refutes this opinion, but denies that they were Christians. It seems now, however, to be generally agreed that this learned commentator was mistaken. A summary of the arguments on both sides may be seen in Mangey's "Lettres pour et contre sur la fameuse

question, si les Solitaires, appellés Therapeutes, estoient Chrétiens."—Paris, 1712.

⁴ Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, ii. 332.

⁵ In the absence of authentic testimony, we have given no account of S. Mark's previous life. According to the tradition of the Egyptian Church, which confounds the Evangelist with S. John Mark, he was a native of Pentapolis. His family was

villages, particularly in Bethany. S. Peter, however, about the year 37, appears to have sent him into Egypt; and it would seem that he entered Alexandria in, or towards, the year 40.¹

Conversion
of S. Annia-
nus.

Here his first convert was one Annianus, or Hananias, a shoemaker by trade; on whom the Evangelist wrought a miracle, and who, in consequence, received him into his house. Having preached the Gospel with great success, and having, in a proportionate degree, irritated the idolatrous inhabitants of the city, than whom no idolaters were more strongly attached to Pagan superstition, S. Mark returned for a season to Jerusalem, first, if

S. Mark
goes to
Jerusalem;

we may believe Coptic tradition, having ordained Annianus

rich; and his father, Aristobulus, was brother to S. Barnabas. An expedition of the Nubians having reduced him to poverty, he migrated, with his household, to Palestine, and settled in one of the villages adjacent to Jerusalem. S. Mark, then known only by the name of John, had early given proofs of a pious and reverent disposition; and S. Peter, who by marriage had become a connexion of Aristobulus, had thus an opportunity of instructing his son in the Faith. Passing by the various miracles which the pious belief of the Alexandrian Church has, without any good grounds, attributed to S. Mark, such as his putting to flight a lion in the vicinity of Jordan, and throwing down, by his prayers, a tree that was the object of superstitious veneration near Ashdod, we may remark that, according to the same tradition, S. Mark was one of the Seventy. It is also asserted that he was one of the servants at the marriage of Cana; that he was the man whom the Apostles met, carrying a pitcher of water, before the Last Supper; that in his house it was that our LORD celebrated that Passover; in his house, also, that the Apostles were assembled secretly for fear of the Jews, when our SAVIOUR appeared to them.—Such, as we said, is Egyptian tradition; among other

writers there is the greatest discrepancy as to his native country and the time of his conversion. Some will have it that it was after the Ascension of our LORD; (S. Augustin. de Consensu Evang. 1;) others, that he had been converted by CHRIST Himself, was one of those who were offended at His declaration concerning His Flesh and Blood, and was afterwards recalled by S. Peter. (S. Epiphan. Hær. 51. (i. 428.) Cornel. à Lapide. Comm. in Act. 219.)

¹ We have in this account followed Sollerius, whose hypothesis seems the only method of reconciling Eusebius with himself. In his Chronicon he says, under the second year of Claudius, (*i. e.* A.D. 42 or 43,) “Mark the Evangelist preaches CHRIST in Egypt and at Alexandria.” This implies that he had been there sometime previously. But, by a comparison of the 15th and 16th chapters of the second book of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, that writer would seem to place the mission of S. Mark after the writing of his gospel. The Chronicon Alexandrinum, Anastasius, and George Syncellus, are agreed in placing it in A.D. 40. A double mission, the one from Jerusalem, the other from Rome, explains the apparent contradiction.

Bishop of the new Church, with three Priests and seven Deacons as his assistants. This seems to have taken place in the year 44.

From Palestine, S. Mark accompanied S. Peter to Rome. ^{to Rome;} It was here that, under the direction of the Apostle, he wrote his Gospel, whether, as some will have it, in Latin, or, as it seems more probable, in Greek; for the Egyptian tradition which assigns to it a Coptic original is not for a moment to be received. It matters little to Alexandrian History whether he founded the Church at Aquileia, or whether that tradition is to be rejected as fabulous. We find him mentioned in the first Epistle of S. Peter, under the affectionate title of "Marcus my son": but this is the only certain information that we possess with respect to the Evangelist, while residing in Rome.¹

It was, apparently, towards the year 49, that S. Mark ^{returns to Alexandria;} returned to Egypt; and there, till the time of his decease, he laboured with great success. And during this period, the first church in Alexandria is said to have been built, at a place called Boucalia, near to the sea shore, and thence called Boucalis, or Baucalis. The name Boucalia arose, if we may believe Strabo, from the fact, that in former times the spot had been appropriated for the pasturage of cattle.

The Egyptians, indignant² at the progress made by the

¹ Le Quien, ii. 340. Renaudot, Pat. Al. 3.

² The date of S. Mark's Martyrdom is a question of almost insuperable difficulty. Eutychius makes it to have taken place in A.D. 54; the Chronicon Orientale, in A.D. 67; the Acts of the Evangelist, in A.D. 68. Eusebius, on the contrary, (H. E. ii. 24,) says expressly *Νέρωνος δὲ ὕγοντος τῆς βασιλείας ἔτος πρῶτος μετὰ Μάρκον τὸν Ἀπόστολον καὶ Ἐυαγγελιστὴν τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικίας Ἀννιανὸς τὴν λειτουργίαν διαδέχεται*. S. Jerome (de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis) confirms this:—*Mortuus est autem octavo Neronis anno*. To which may be added the common Martyrologies. Now the eighth year

of Nero began October 13, A.D. 61; and, as it is agreed on all hands that S. Mark suffered on the 25th of April, it must have been in A.D. 62. To this a difficulty, arising from ancient traditions, is opposed. The Evangelist is said, in the most ancient Martyrologies, to have departed to his reward on the 29th or 30th of the month Pharmuthi, that is, the 24th or 25th of April, and on Easter Day. Now it is certain that from the year 45 to the end of the first century, Easter Day never fell on the 24th or 25th of April. It might be sufficient to reply that the uncertainty of the time of the celebration of Easter, even at a period much subsequent to this, forbids us to draw any very definite con-

Gospel, resolved to be avenged on its first preacher. A feast in honour of Serapis, held annually on the twenty-fifth of April, was approaching. Advantage was taken of the circumstance to excite and organize a riot, on the preceding day, Saturday, April 24: the rather, that the Evangelist had denounced the approaching festivity as idolatrous and impious. Seizing S. Mark, and tying a rope round his neck, they drew him through the principal streets of the city, till the blood gushed from his sides: and, at evening, they threw him into prison, while consulting with respect to his fate. On the same night the sufferer was cheered by the appearance of an Angel, who

and suffers
Martyrdom
April 25,
A.D. 62.

clusion from the assertion of the Martyrologies, even if we admit it to be true. Yet that the Evangelist suffered on a Sunday seems, from this tradition, extremely probable; and it is well nigh certain that it was on a great feast of Serapis, for on this all historians are agreed. Now there was a Feast of Serapis on the 25th of April; and since the Dominical letter of A.D. 62 is C, the 25th of April in that year fell on a Sunday. Nor is it difficult to explain how it afterwards came to be asserted that S. Mark suffered on Easter Day. The genuine Acts may have mentioned the fact, that he was slain on April 25, which was Sunday, and a great Festival; meaning thereby, a great Festival of Serapis. On which some ignorant transcriber, supposing a great Christian Festival to be meant, inserted the word *Paschali* before *Dominica*. Or again, this Sunday may have been called the Paschal Sunday, because it fell within the Paschal time; *i. e.*, the period between Easter and Whitsunday. Or lastly, the Paschal Festivity may mean any Sunday, as being the Feast of the LORD'S Resurrection. And all the MSS. Acts consulted by Sollerius, say simply, *Beatissimam festivitatem nostram Paschalem, ID EST, Dominicum diem*. Bonjour has col-

lected other examples, where Sunday is spoken of in a similar manner. (Append. ad Diss. de nomine Pat. Joseph. p. 45).

So far the date, Sunday, April 25, A.D. 62, seems satisfactory. Another difficulty, however, meets us. It is expressly affirmed by the Acts, that S. Mark suffered on the Sunday, but was not slain till the next day. In the year 62, therefore, he must have finished his course on Monday, April 26; but this is contrary to all testimony. We answer that, though the Acts assert that the confession of the Evangelist lasted two days, they also introduce the Pagans saying, *Quod Serapis, in sua HODIE festivitate, hunc virum voluit invisere*. In this case, the Evangelist must have been arrested on Saturday, April 24. If, however, it should be insisted that the Evangelist was arrested on Sunday, and slain on the Feast of Serapis, there is no occasion, with Tillemont and Bonjour, to postpone his Martyrdom to 68:—it would be enough, with Pontac, to place his passion on Sunday, April 24, being the 3rd Sunday after Easter, and his death on Monday, April 25, A.D. 63. We prefer, however, to rest on the authority of Eusebius, and to attribute a slight inaccuracy to the Acts.

comforted him with the assurance that his name was in the Book of Life; and shortly afterwards by a Vision of the SAVIOUR Himself, Who, addressing him by the title of Mark the Evangelist, bade peace be with him. To Whom S. Mark replied, "I yield Thee thanks, O SAVIOUR, that Thou hast counted me worthy to suffer for Thy Name." On the next day, the Pagans drew the Evangelist around the city, as before, until with the words, "Into Thy Hands I commend my spirit," he went to his rest. It was by the side of the Martyr's tomb in the church of Baucalis, that the election of the Patriarchs took place in after times.

We must not pass over in silence the celebrated account which Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria in the tenth century, has given, with respect to the custom introduced by S. Mark concerning the election of Bishops in that Sec. Though this writer's statement has been repeatedly noticed and confuted, it still remains a staple argument with Presbyterians, and a History of the Church of Alexandria were incomplete without an examination into its truth.

The words of Eutychius are as follows: "S. Mark along with Ananias, ordained twelve Presbyters, to remain with the Patriarch; so that when the Chair should become vacant, they might elect one out of the twelve, on whose head the other eleven should lay their hands, give him benediction, and constitute him Patriarch; and should after this choose some other man, to supply the place of the promoted Presbyter, in such sort that the Presbytery should always consist of twelve. This custom continued at Alexandria till the time of the Patriarch Alexander, one of the Three hundred and eighteen"; (the writer, of course, means the Fathers of Nicæa;) "who forbade the Presbyters in future to ordain their Patriarch, but decreed that on a vacancy of the See the neighbouring Bishops should convene for the purpose of filling it with a proper Patriarch, whether elected from those twelve Presbyters, or from any others." Eutychius adds, that during the time of the first ten Patriarchs there were no Bishops in Egypt; Demetrius, the eleventh, having been the first to consecrate them.

Early constitution of the Alexandrian Church,

as described by Eutychius,

If, then, we are to take this writer's words in their literal sense, we must believe that the Second Sec in the Catholic Church was for

the space of one hundred and fifty years governed by Arch-Priests; that these men, during that period, refrained from the ordination of other Bishops, though presuming to lay hands on Priests and the inferior orders of the hierarchy: that the eleventh Patriarch asserted his claim to consecrate Bishops; and that six of his successors, for nearly a hundred years, persevered in this practice without a remonstrance from, and enjoying communion with, every other branch of the Church.

and S.
Jerome,

So monstrous a story at first leads us to regard its author as grossly misinformed, or a pure fabricator. Yet the authority of S. Jerome forbids us to do this. That Father, in an epistle to Evagrius,¹ while dwelling on the dignity of the Priesthood, thus expresses himself: "At Alexandria, from the time of S. Mark the Evangelist to that of the Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius," (that is, till the middle of the third century,) "it was the custom of the Presbyters to nominate one, elected from among themselves, to the higher dignity of the Bishoprick; just as the army makes an emperor, or the Deacons nominate as Archdeacon any man whom they know to be of active habits in their own body."

The above quoted passage from Eutychius was first published by the learned Selden, with a very prolix commentary, as a prop to the falling cause of Presbyterianism. It was refuted at the time by Abraham Echellensis, and afterwards by Renaudot and Le Quien. Two different explanations have been given, either of which is perfectly satisfactory.

not Presby-
terian.

In the first place, it may well be asserted that the words of Eutychius refer to the election, not to the consecration, of the Bishop. It was the custom in the early Church, that not only Presbyters, but even laics, laid their hands on the head of the party so chosen; and this was the case more especially in the Coptic Church, as writers, both Catholic and Jacobite, allow. And Echellensis has clearly proved, that, in many instances at least, a triple imposition of hands took place; of the people voting, of the Presbyters electing, of the Bishops consecrating. At the same time, the Presbyters of Alexandria had certain privileges which the Presbyters of other Churches did not enjoy; and these two facts, coming together to the knowledge

Privileges of
the Alexandrian Pres-
byters,
what,

¹ Opp. i. 1082. [Ed. Vall.]

of an ignorant writer like Eutychius, may have occasioned the fable to which the unhappy consequences of the Western Reformation have given such undue celebrity. S. Jerome's testimony is decided against those who bring him forward as a witness; for, at the very time he is stretching to their very utmost the privileges of the Priesthood, he asks, "What is there which a Bishop may do, EXCEPT ORDINATION, that a Presbyter may not do?"¹ Again, as it has been well remarked, how could the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 339, have decided against the orders conferred by one Coluthus, himself a Presbyter, when, within the memory of living men, the Patriarch had received no other ordination? Or is it likely that among the various charges brought in succeeding ages against the Church of Egypt, this of Presbyterian ordination should never have been one?

It may, however, be granted, that the Patriarch was really ordained by these twelve Presbyters.² It is, then, certain that they were an Episcopal College, retaining the name, which in

and whence
possibly
arising.

¹ Yet even this passage proves that S. Jerome is stretching the point to its very utmost. For in his dialogue against the Luciferians, (Opp. ii. 181,) he also reserves the power of confirming to the Bishop alone.

² This hypothesis, however, is stoutly denied by Pearson, Abraham Echellensis, and Sollerius, and they affirm that Diocesan Bishops existed in the Alexandrian Patriarchate from the very first. In confirmation of this view, they quote the Melchite Martyrology, the Acts of S. Mark by Severus, Simeon Metaphrastes, and, above all, the letter of Hadrian to Servianus, quoted in the life of Saturninus by Vopiscus, where he distinctly mentions some, *qui se CHRISTI Episcopos dicunt*. They also observe that Heraclas, had he increased the number of Bishops, would in all probability have been commended for it by his encomiast Eusebius; and that in the time of S. Alexander there were a hundred Bishops in Egypt, while we find no

hint of a recent addition to the Episcopal body. At the same time, it must be confessed that none of these arguments can in any respect be considered decisive, except that adduced from the letter of Hadrian; and he might easily have been mistaken on this point, as he is in the same letter on others, regarding the Christians.

It is easy to reconcile the discrepancy between the two narrations of the early constitution of the Alexandrian Church, by imagining that at first, as we said, it consisted of seven Deacons and three Priests; but that the Evangelist, on his second visit to Alexandria, found the number of the Faithful so much increased; as to call for the establishment of a Presbyteral (or Episcopal) College. This whole subject is most ably treated by Sollerius, Parergon I., Hist. Chron. Pat. Alex. pp. 9*, 10*, 11* of the fifth volume of the Bollandine June; and by Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, ii. 342.

the Primitive Church was used synonymously with Bishops. That the case is so in the Acts is well known. S. Paul, for example, having called the Presbyters of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus, warned them to take heed unto all the flock, over the which the HOLY GHOST had made them *Bishops*. And that there was such an Episcopal College at Alexandria appears likely from two considerations. The one, that the account of Eutychius as to the absence of any Bishops in Egypt till the third century thus receives some confirmation, since we may well suppose that this College governed the country jointly, and that till the time of Demetrius it was not divided, to use the word in the modern sense, into Dioceses; the other, that we may thus account for the extraordinary privileges retained by the College when it became really Presbyteral, more especially that of provincial letters being addressed in its name jointly with the Patriarch's.

Let the case, however, be as it may, Eutychius's authority is little worth, since, in asserting that till the Nicene Council the Patriarchs were invariably elected from the order of Presbyters, he asserts that which is contrary to fact, Demetrius for example having been a layman till called to the Chair of S. Mark. And among the many frivolous objections raised against S. Athanasius, his immediate elevation from the Diaconate to the Patriarchate does not appear.

SECTION II.

Peace enjoyed by the early Alexandrian Church.

IT pleased God, that the Church which was afterwards to be exposed to such fierce persecution from the Pagan power, and to struggle for its very existence with heresy under two forms, should, in its infancy, be in great measure protected from the storms which fell upon its sister Churches. Time was thus given for its establishment and consolidation; the True Faith took deep root in the hearts of the people of Alexandria, and, in due season, brought forth fruit to perfection. During the first two centuries, Egypt enjoyed unusual quiet; and little is known of its ecclesiastical history beyond the names of its Patriarchs.

On the decease of S. Mark, S. Annianus¹ succeeded to the government of the Church. He was a man, says Eusebius,² beloved of God, and admirable in all things. In his time the number of the Faithful was increased exceedingly.³ His memory was held in great veneration by the Egyptians, and a church under his invocation long existed⁴ at Alexandria. He governed the See⁵ twenty-two years: and had for his successor Abilius,⁶ or Melianus, who is said to have been the first of the three Presbyters whom S. Mark, at his first visit to Alexandria, had ordained. The remark of the *Chronicon Orientale*, "the Church during his time was in peace," renders it probable that the case had been otherwise during the Episcopate of Annianus. And it is not unlikely that, in the massacre of the Alexandrian Jews which followed the siege of Jerusalem, some of the Christians might have suffered. On this subject, however, we have no certain information. The persecution of Domitian does not appear to have extended to Egypt. Abilius governed the Church for nearly fourteen years: and was succeeded by Cerdo,⁷ one of the Presbyters whom S. Mark had ordained. He presided over his diocese for about nine⁸ years; and there is an obscure tra-

Succession
of S. Annianus,
Patr. II.,
A.D. 62.

S. Abilius,
Patr. III.,
A.D. 84.

S. Cerdo,
Patr. IV.,
A.D. 98.

¹ He is also called Anianus; and in the Latin Acts of S. Mark, published by Wolfgang Lazius, Anizanus. Reuterdahl will have the name spelt Ammianus; Eutychius Hananias.

² Euseb. H. E. ii. 24.

³ Severus, ap. Renaud. 2.

⁴ S. Epiphanius, Hær. 69.

⁵ So Eusebius, (iii. 12,) S. Nicephorus, Eutychius, Severus, Makrizius; though they do not agree as to the year of his decease, dating the commencement of his episcopate differently.

⁶ Eusebius, both in his History and in his Chronicle, with the other Greek and Latin authors, calls him Abilius; the Coptic writers name him Miloi, the Arabs, Melianus. In Eutychius, by a manifest error, he is termed Philetius. The author of the Apostolic Constitutions asserts that

he was consecrated by S. Luke; (vii. 48,) which is contrary to Eastern tradition.

⁷ The *Chronicon Orientale* asserts that the See was vacant for three years after the decease of Abilius, and Tillemont follows its authority. But Sollerius (p. 15*) amply disproves this assertion, and indeed the reason assigned in the *Chronicon*, "because at that time the destruction of Jerusalem happened," destroys whatever authority the statement might otherwise possess.

⁸ There is a discrepancy between the Chronicle and History of Eusebius; the former gives eleven years to Cerdo, the latter merely asserts that he died about the twelfth year of Hadrian. (H. E. iv. 1.) We follow Sollerius.

Primus,
Patr. V.,
A.D. 107.

A.D. 115.

S. Justus,
Patr. VI.,
A.D. 119.

S. Eumenius,
Patr. VII.,
A.D. 130.

dition that he suffered Martyrdom under Trajan. Primus,¹ who is also called Ephraim, next ascended the Evangelical Throne. He was a layman, and was advanced for his angelical purity of life.² His Episcopate was in all probability a season of trouble. The Jews³ of Egypt and Cyrene, as if possessed by an evil spirit, fell on the Pagans among whom they dwelt, massacred them without mercy, carried every thing before them, and compelled their enemies to retire within the walls of Alexandria, where they revenged themselves by enslaving or murdering such of the Jews as were dwelling in that city. Nor was it till Marcius Turbo, into whose hands Trajan committed the conduct of the war, had defeated the rebels in several battles, and had slaughtered many thousands of them, that peace was restored to the country. Primus, after an Episcopate of twelve years, was succeeded by Justus;⁴ a man who was good and wise,⁵ and beloved⁶ of God. He is said to have been baptised by the Evangelist;⁷ and, doubtless, the Egyptian Church would delight in honouring such, more especially at a time when few who had personally known S. Mark could be yet surviving. To Justus succeeded Eumenius;⁸ and it is remarkable that history is still silent as to the sufferings, which there almost certainly must have been, of the Alexandrian Church,⁹ during the time that Hadrian was in Egypt, where he restored the pillar of Pompey, and attended the apotheosis of his favourite Antinous. And in the great and last insurrection of the Jews, led on by the impostor Barcochebas, the Egyptian Christians¹⁰ suffered severely from

¹ He is called Primus by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 4) and other Greek and Latin writers. See Dodwell's Supplement to Pearson's Dissertation, p. 58. But by Eastern writers he is termed Abrimius or Aprimius; and Papebrochius supposes his real name to have been Ephrem. (Conf. Soller. p. 16*).

² Severus, ap. Renaudot, p. 16.

³ Eusebius, H. E. iv. 2. This rebellion is also mentioned by Orosius, Dion, and Spartianus.

⁴ Eusebius, H. E. iv. 4. He is called Justinus by Nicephorus.

⁵ Severus, ap. Renaudot, p. 16.

⁶ Chronicon Orientale. Sollerius, 7*.

⁷ Such is the tradition of the Ethiopic Church. Renaudot, p. 17.

⁸ Eusebius (H. E. iv. 11) calls him Eumenes; but in his Chronicle, Hymeneus.

⁹ The only author who mentions that Alexandria suffered in the persecution of Hadrian, is Macrizius; and he refers it to the Episcopate of Primus, when, indeed, that persecution might have commenced in Egypt; though it did not attain its utmost fury till after the succession of Justus.

¹⁰ Eusebius, H. E. iv. 8. Sollerius, 18*.

the fury of the rebels, who would have had them join in their revolt. At the same time Alexandria was infected by the fanatic teaching of Basileides¹ and Carpocrates, both natives of that city. To enter into an exposition of the Gnostic heresy would lead us too far from our immediate subject: inasmuch as it does not appear that the Alexandrian Church was peculiarly interested in its rise, or opposed to its progress.

Marcian² was the successor of Eumenius, of whom nothing whatever is known: and Marcian was followed by Celadion.³ Of this Bishop nothing is related except the love that his flock bore to him; and that he was succeeded by Agrippinus.⁴ He, in his turn, left the Patriarchal Throne to Julian.⁵

A barren list of names is all that history has left us with respect to these early Bishops of Alexandria; all of whom, however, with the exception perhaps of Primus, are reckoned among the Saints. With the successor of Julian we leave uncertain traditions, and uninteresting catalogues, and enter on the real History of the Church of Alexandria.

S. Marcian,
Patr. VIII.,
A.D. 143.

S. Celadion,
Patr. IX.,
A.D. 153.

S. Agrippi-
nus, Patr.
X., A.D. 167.

S. Julian,
Patr. XI.,
A.D. 179.

¹ Eusebius, H. E. iv. 7. On the different tenets of the stricter followers of Basileides, and the Carpocratians, the reader cannot do better than consult Fuldner, *Dritte Denkschrift*, &c., p. 180.

² Eusebius, H. E. iv. 6, terms him Mark; and it is probable, as Sollierius has observed, that this was his real name, but was altered by the Egyptians out of reverence to the Evangelist; just as in the Roman Church no Pope has ever been named Peter. No Alexandrian Patriarch bore the name of Mark till the beginning of the ninth century.

³ So he is called by Eusebius, Nicephorus, George Syncellus; Celasdiannus in the Coptic Index; Claudian by Severus, Eutychius, the *Chronicon Orientale*, Elmacinus, Makrizi. Abu'lberkat also names him Beladion; our Jacobite Catalogue

كالازيانوا

⁴ Eusebius, H. E. iv. 19. Abu'lberkat calls him Agrippius or Agrippa. The chronology of his Patriarchate, which is involved in some obscurity by an apparent self-contradiction on the part of Eusebius, is ably expounded by Sollierius.

⁵ Eusebius, H. E. v. 9. Severus has a strange observation, connected with this Prelate; after his time, says he, no Bishop remained at Alexandria. The most intelligible explanation of this assertion, which is also confirmed by the authority of the *Chronicon Orientale*, is that the increasing severity of persecution rendered the succeeding Bishops, at one time or other, fugitives from their See; which till then they had not been compelled to leave. In the chronology we have followed Sollierius, though we have not considered it necessary to swell our pages with an exposition of his arguments.

SECTION III.

Demetrius,
Patr. XII.,
A.D. 189.

how elected.

WHILE the Patriarch Julian—so runs the Egyptian legend,—was on his death bed, he was informed by an Angel, that the man who should, on the succeeding day, bring him a present of grapes,¹ was designed as his successor. On the morrow, a countryman, who could neither read nor write, and who was married, made his appearance in the predicted manner, and Julian acknowledged him as the future Patriarch. Demetrius was so unwilling to receive the proffered dignity, that he was ordained by main force; and, from the time of his consecration, he became another man. He immediately applied himself with success to the study of the Scriptures, and became one of the most learned prelates of his time. His being a married man rendered his flock, if we may trust Severus, unwilling at first to receive him as Patriarch, as it happened that, from S. Mark downward, none such had been promoted to the See. This indisposition, however, was shortly removed, probably by the exemplary character of the new Prelate; for the miracle which, according to Coptic tradition, established his continence, is unworthy of relation, and far more so of belief.

Conversion
of Philip.

Demetrius had presided over his Church fourteen years, when the terrible persecution of Severus, reckoned as the sixth, broke over the Church. ²Philip was at the time Prefect of Egypt: one of the most honourable posts which it was in the power of

¹ This tale is related or referred to by Severus, the *Chronicon Orientale*, and Elmacinus. Renaudot, pp. 20, 21. The Copts, on the twelfth of Bermaha, (=March 8) commemorate the miracle by which Demetrius proved his continence.

He displayed, this day, the power of virginity by the Grace of CHRIST: He covered fire in a basket, and the vest of his wife, says the Ethiopic poet. See Ludolf, *Comm. ad Hist. Ethiop.* p. 448.

ረርረዮ : ዮሐን : ኃይለ : ድንጋልሁ : በሠምረተ :
ሕልፈ :
ዐቀረ : ኦሳተ : በኩፋረ : ወለብኦሲቱ : በአጽፈ :

² Baron. Ann. 204, vi.

the emperors to bestow, and known above others by the name of the Augustal Prefecture. Philip, however, with his wife Claudia, and daughter Eugenia, embraced the Christian Faith; and though he made no secret of his conversion, he was permitted to retain his dignity for some time after it had taken place. Severus having, at length, become acquainted with the fact, wrote to the Prefect, upbraiding him with the ill return he had made for the kindness shewn him; he had been honoured, he said, rather as a king than as a prefect, and while he retained the faith of his forefathers, he was worthy of the dignity. He must at once either renounce the superstition to which he had attached himself, or submit to be deprived of the office which he had so long held. On receiving these commands, Philip feigned illness, and availed himself of the relaxation thus obtained from public business, to convert all his possessions into money, which he bestowed on the poor. Having done this, he returned a firm answer to Severus, who superseded him in his government by Terentius Lætus. The new Prefect had express orders to destroy Philip. This, however, was not so easy to be accomplished: the populace still loved and respected the deposed governor, and it was necessary to have recourse to stratagem. A hired band of ruffians were easily engaged: having dispatched Philip in his own house, they were, to save appearances, thrown into prison; from whence they were speedily liberated. Severus himself paid a visit to Egypt; and, as a popular measure, permitted that in future a senator should be made prefect. Hitherto that honour had, by the institution of Augustus, been conferred on men of equestrian rank only.

his martyr-
dom.

The persecution, on the approach of Severus to Alexandria, began to be so severe in Egypt, that many believed the days of Antichrist to be at hand. Alexandria itself was the scene of many martyrdoms,¹ because the Christians, arrested in the various parts of the province, were sent thither for trial and execution. The most celebrated among its victims was S. Leonidas,² the father of the more famous Origen. He had

Persecution
of Severus.

¹ Eusebius, H. E. vi. 1.

S. Jerome, preserved in the Vatican.

² He has been sometimes called a Bishop; by Suidas, for example, and by two MSS. copies of the catalogue of

But that he was so is, to say the least, very uncertain.

Birth of
Origen ;

his educa-
tion at
home ;

carefully educated his son, till the seventeenth year of his age, not only in the Scriptures, but also in the usual studies of the time. Every day, before entering on the latter, it was his habit to require the repetition of some portion of the former, which he then explained and enforced. The quick mind of Origen was not satisfied with the literal signification ; he eagerly inquired after the mystical meaning, which he considered to possess the deeper interest, and more richly to repay the study. S. Leonidas considered it right to check these demonstrations of that fertility of genius for which Origen became afterwards so remarkable ; he advised him to confine his inquiries to subjects more suitable to his age, and not to enter on topics which were only fitting for the ripe theologian. Yet, in private, he would bless God for the talents which He had bestowed on his son ; and often, while the latter slept, he would steal to his bedside, and kiss that breast which he looked on as a special shrine of the HOLY GHOST. Besides Origen, Leonidas had six other sons : the name of their mother is unknown.

and in the
Catechetical
School ;

history of
that school.

Athena-
goras :

S. Pantænus :

The Catechetical School of Alexandria possessed at this time a high reputation in the Church. It had its origin¹ in the first century ; but its earliest master with whom we are acquainted was Athenagoras.—He had been an Athenian philosopher, and on his conversion, wrote an apology for Christianity, unknown to Eusebius and S. Jerome, but cited by S. Epiphanius. We have also another work of his, in defence of the probability of a Resurrection. To Athenagoras succeeded the more celebrated Father of the Church, Pantænus. An Hebrew by nation, a Sicilian by birth,² he was in philosophy an Eclectic ;³ and drew his principal dogmas from the Stoic and Pythagorean sects.

¹ “ A Marco Evangelistâ semper Ecclesiastici fuere doctores,” is S. Jerome’s statement, when writing of S. Pantænus, in his Catalogue.

² Thus Le Moine (Var. Sac. ii. 207) reconciles the two accounts of Clemens, —in one of which he calls Pantænus a Sicilian bee,—in the other he seems to mention him as a Jew. Valesius, in his note on Eusebius v. 11 (vol. ii. p. 64, n. 6, ed. Heinichen) and Dupin,

(Biblioth. Eccles. i. 232, not. a, Ed. 2) deny that he was a Jew.

³ Eusebius, (H. E. v. 10) asserts him to have been a Stoic ;—Philippus Sidetes, a Pythagorean. The latter author makes Pantænus, by mistake, to have been the pupil of Clemens ; perhaps by a distortion of the fact that he did, in a certain sense, succeed him on his return from India.

While he presided over the Alexandrian school, the Indians sent to Demetrius, requesting him to dispatch some teacher of the Faith to that country, who should be recommended no less by his learning than by his character. Pantænus accepted the office with joy,—and left the government of his school in the hands of his celebrated disciple, Clemens.

Clemens :

In the Catechetical School, therefore, Origen¹ was placed ; and under Clemens, (whom we shall have occasion to mention more at length hereafter,) made rapid progress not only in sacred, but also in profane literature. Here,² in all probability, he formed that friendship with Alexander, afterwards Bishop of Jerusalem, which was at a later period so important to his welfare. He also attended the lectures of Ammonius,³ from whom he drank deeply of that Platonic philosophy which more or less tinged his writings.

On the breaking out of the persecution, such was Origen's desire for martyrdom, that he was scarcely to be prevented, by the tears and entreaties of his mother, from denouncing himself at the tribunal of the governor. And on the apprehension of his father, he was restrained by little short of main force. Happy had it been for him had he thus early and gloriously ended his life ! happy, had he not been spared to leave a doctrine that divided the Church for centuries, and a reputation of so doubtful a nature that the salvation of Origen was one of the most famous questions of antiquity ! He at length contented himself with encouraging S. Leonidas to endure to the end, neither regarding his own sufferings, nor the destitute condition of his wife, and her seven sons, of whom Origen, young as he was, was the eldest. S. Leonidas⁴ was

Origen's
poverty ;

¹ Euseb. H. E. vi. 6.

Suidas, Eusebius, and Nicephorus put the fact beyond doubt. Huet., Origeniana, i. 6.

² This seems to follow from Euseb. H. E. vi. 14, as De la Rue well observes.

³ This is denied by Baronius, s. a. . Roman Martyrology on the 22nd of April.

⁴ He is commemorated by the

heretic, whom she had adopted as her heir, he was at length compelled, through hatred of the false doctrine with which he was thus continually brought in contact, to seek an asylum elsewhere. He then undertook to teach the science of grammar, and in this manner obtained a precarious subsistence.

Pantænus, on his return from India,—where he had found some traces of the labours of S. Bartholomew, and had discovered, it is said, a Gospel of S. Matthew, written in Hebrew,¹—reassumed his place in the Alexandrian School, assisted by Clemens: Origen heard and revered both.² On the death of his master, Clemens succeeded to the entire management of the school. But the fury of the persecution increasing, he was tempted to relinquish his charge, and to retire into Cappadocia. On this, Origen, then but eighteen years old, but whose learning was already famous, by degrees, and, as it would seem, at first of his own accord, undertook the conduct³ of the first Christian school in the world. Some time having elapsed, and there appearing no hope that the persecution would cease, or that Clemens would return, Demetrius confirmed Origen in his charge, and entrusted to him the care of the Catechumens.

he is made
head of the
Alexandrian
school:

Origen's first resolution on assuming his new office was, to apply himself entirely to the study of theology.⁴ With this view, he sold all his grammatical and philosophical books, for an annuity of four oboli a day: and his frugality and abstemiousness enabled him to support life on this small sum. His meals were so scanty, that he seriously impaired his health; he never tasted wine; he had but one garment; in the severest winters it was his custom to go barefoot; his fasts were frequent and rigorous, and he had no other couch but the bare floor. His reputation for learning and ability soon extended itself widely. His disciples were numerous; they attended him not only from the commoner class of Christians, but from those of higher

his ascetic
life:

¹ Euseb. H. E. v. 16.

² Huet cannot understand how Origen could have been (Euseb. vi. 14) a disciple of Pantænus: Tillemont explains the difficulty.

³ Thus De la Rue reconciles Euseb. (H. E. vi. 1) with S. Jerome, (Catalog. Script. Eccles. 54,) ; and his account

is far more probable than the usual history deduced by Huet and others, from the words of Eusebius. See note *a*, Huet. Origen. p. 83, as appended to the fourth volume of De la Rue's Edition of Origen.

⁴ Euseb. H. E. vi. 3.

attainments in philosophy; nay, there were Pagans who scrupled not to be his auditors. In the meantime, the persecution became still more violent under Aquila,¹ the successor of Lætus; and many of Origen's disciples laid down their lives for the truth. The first of these was Plutarch, his earliest hearer; Origen accompanied him to the place of suffering, and consoled him in his last moments. The friends of Plutarch, however, regarding him as the cause of the disgrace and death of their relation, attempted his life; and he narrowly escaped their designs. Six others of his disciples fell in the same persecution. Serenus was burnt; Heracleides, a catechumen, and Heron, who had but recently received baptism, were beheaded; another Serenus was honoured by Martyrdom, but in what manner is unknown; and Herais,² also a catechumen, received, says the historian, a baptism of fire. But of all the pupils of Origen, Basileides was the most celebrated.

A Christian slave, named Potamiæna, having refused to comply with the unholy suggestions of her master, was accused by him to Aquila, and condemned, after being stripped, to be plunged into a caldron of boiling pitch. She requested that she might be allowed to retain her garments, and voluntarily offered to be lowered by slow degrees into it. Her offer was accepted, and Basileides was appointed to preside at the execution. He treated her with as much kindness as circumstances enabled him to bestow, and in assuring him of her gratitude, she also promised not to forget him in the state on which she was about to enter. A short time afterwards, his comrades, for some unrecorded reason, endeavoured to oblige him to swear by the gods. He refused, alleging that he was a Christian. They at first treated the declaration as made in jest; but, on discovering that Basileides spoke seriously, they hurried him before the

martyrdom
of his disci-
ples:

of S. Pota-
miæna:

¹ Baronius, (A.D. 205, vi.) thinks that at the beginning of the persecution of Aquila he left Alexandria, and took refuge at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, where he remained two years. He rests for his authority on a statement of Palladius (c. 147). But the account hardly agrees with Origen's great desire of martyrdom.

² Valesius, (in H. E. vi. 4) distinguishes three martyrs of this name, respectively commemorated on the 5th of March, and the 5th and 23rd of September. They are not mentioned in the Coptic Calendar, perhaps because they were pupils of Origen.

of S. Basilides.

prefect, and thence to prison. The Christians were no less astonished at his confession than the Pagans; not having any previous reason to imagine him a convert. In answer to their inquiries as to the method in which the event was brought about, he informed them that his conversion was wrought by a vision, in which S. Potamiæna had appeared, and holding forth a crown promised it to him. He was baptised in the prison, and beheaded the next day.

Origen's ardour

Undismayed by the sufferings of his friends and disciples, Origen let no opportunity pass of shewing his sympathy with the sufferers in the cause of CHRIST. He visited them in prison, he was at their side when before the tribunal, he accompanied them to the place of punishment; he conversed with them, he prayed with them, he encouraged them, he supported them, he gave them the kiss of peace. He exposed himself in every possible manner to the fury of the heathens, from whom, on several occasions, he very narrowly escaped; he was more than once arrested, and his life seemed preserved by the special interposition of Providence.

and mistaken zeal.

Demetrius¹ heard with feelings of respect and admiration the hardy actions of the young Christian philosopher; and encouraged him to persevere in the path he had chosen, assuring him that it could not fail of obtaining a glorious reward. But, after a while, rumours of a less pleasing character reached the ears of the Bishop. It was said that Origen had interpreted too literally the saying of our SAVIOUR with respect to those eunuchs who had made themselves so for the kingdom of Heaven's sake, and had indeed acted on that misinterpretation. Demetrius interrogated him on the subject, and obtained a confirmation of the fact from his own lips: he pleaded in extenuation, that the situations into which he was thrown as "Catechist," when attended by women as well as by men, presented sometimes considerable temptation, the occurrence of which he thought it better to prevent. Demetrius heard his defence with more of surprise than anger; indeed, considering the harsh manner in which he afterwards treated Origen, he hardly appears to have, in the outset, dealt fairly with him. It is but just to add, that at a

¹ Euseb. H. E. vi. 8.

later period of life, Origen himself condemned his own misinterpretation of the passage in question.¹

About the same time, Origen published his first commentary on the Canticles, which, at a later period of his life, after a careful revisal, he again² presented to the public, thus ingenuously confessing, that to attempt the exposition of Holy Scripture at so immature an age, was both presumptuous and dangerous.

The death of the Emperor Severus put a stop to the persecution; for Caracalla, whether from motives of policy or humanity, commanded that it should not be carried on. Origen profited by the calm to visit Rome,³ where his stay was of no long continuance. Demetrius was so sensible of the value of his labours, that he urged him to resume them without loss of time, so little culpability did he at this period attach to the hasty act we have before related. Origen, however, feeling himself physically unequal to the whole responsibility of the Christian school, divided it into two portions; the one containing the students of inferior ability or learning; the other, those whose parts and application were more remarkable. The former division he entrusted to the care of Heraclas,⁴ his friend and pupil, brother of S. Plutarch the Martyr, and the successor of both Origen and Demetrius; of the more advanced class he took charge himself. He undertook the study of the Hebrew language, in which he acquired considerable proficiency by comparing the original with the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and the Seventy. His lectures on philosophy and the subjects connected with it, were attended by many of the heathen students; his name was mentioned by the philosophers with respect, and their writings were dedicated to him. Nor had he less reputation among heretics. One of these, a Valentinian,

A.C. 211.

He goes to Rome:

associates Heraclas with himself:

¹ For example: on S. Matthew xix. 12, he says, Χρήσιμον εἰς ἀποτροπὴν θερμῶν μὲν τῇ πίστει νεωτέρων, οἷς ὁμολογεῖν χρῆ ὅτι ἔρωτα σωφροσύνης ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν, κ.τ.λ. where he is evidently referring to his own case. (Ed. De la Rue, iii. 654, E.)

² S. Hieron. Præf. in Abd. vi. 361.

³ Baronius, ii. 459, fixes this jour-

ney of Origen's to Rome in the reign of Heliogabalus, whereas Eusebius (vi. 14,) expressly places it in that of Caracalla. The Cardinal imagines him also to have undertaken a second journey thither in 248, A.D., from a misunderstanding of Porphyry. Valerius corrects both these errors.

⁴ Euseb. H. E. vi. 15.

named Ambrose, of great reputation in the city both for his riches and ability, was converted by him to the Catholic Faith ; and this success was the means of establishing still more firmly his reputation. Many other heretics and many Pagans were brought to a knowledge of the truth by the profound reasonings and eloquence of the Christian philosopher. Of the heathen who did not embrace the Faith, many openly professed themselves admirers of its teacher : and the testimony of Porphyry, the bitter enemy of Christianity, as preserved by Eusebius, shews in what general estimation Origen was held. It would appear that in these occupations several years passed away : nor was Origen's career of usefulness interrupted till a governor of Arabia, having heard much of the prodigy of learning that had arisen at Alexandria, dispatched a pressing request to the Bishop and to the Prefect, that they would send him without loss of time into that country. Origen went, and having satisfied his entertainers on some points of science, returned again into Egypt. But his tranquillity was disturbed, and his life endangered, by civil commotions.

visits
Arabia,

A.D. 215,

Alexandria had made herself "drunk with the blood of the martyrs," and her time for punishment had come. Caracalla, who professed to form his habits on those of Alexander the Great, affected a particular love for the city of which that Conqueror was the founder. The inhabitants by no means reciprocated this friendly feeling, and made the Emperor the subject of their raillery, to which the whole course of his life laid him open, but especially the murder of his brother ; and raillery was an offence which he could not forgive. Under pretence of a solemn festival he assembled the youth of the city ; and at a given signal, a part of his troops fell upon them, while another part commenced a massacre in the town, which lasted many days. The number of the dead was never known ; "nor did it matter," observed Caracalla, in writing to the Senate, "how many had actually suffered, since all deserved to do so."

and on the
massacre of
Caracalla

retires into
Palestine.

From these scenes Origen withdrew into Palestine, and took up his abode at Cæsarea. And hence we may date the rise of his troubles. He was not yet in Priest's orders ; but the different Bishops of Palestine, out of respect to his learning and character, invited him to explain the Scriptures in their

respective churches. Demetrius, on receiving the news of this proceeding, wrote a remonstrance; the thing, he said, was uncanonical and irregular; none but a Priest could speak in the presence of his Bishop; and that even a Priest should do so, had been, and was, in many places counted improper; Origen, on the contrary, had not yet arrived at that dignity, and took upon himself this office out of his own Diocese. Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus¹ of Cæsarea urged, in reply, that they were not the first who had thus authorised laics; that it had been the practice of Bishops, who possessed the most eminent reputation for sanctity, such as Neon at Laranda,² Atticus at Synnada, and Celsus at Iconium; that if any person, not in Holy Orders, was capable of throwing any light on the Scripture, his assistance should be accepted with thankfulness, not stigmatised as an intrusion, and forbidden as an irregularity. This answer did not satisfy Demetrius; and it must be confessed, that although jealousy of Origen's attainments might have in some degree influenced his conduct, his objections had much force, and scarcely any violation of the Canons might not be justified on grounds similar to those adopted by the Bishops of Palestine. The Prelate not only wrote to Origen, but sent some of his deacons to command his instant return, and the order was obeyed.

His misunderstanding with Demetrius.

Origen was now engaged, at the request of his friend Ambrose, in the composition of those Commentaries on Holy Scripture, some of which have descended to our own time. His friend's zeal scarcely allowed the philosopher the necessary time for food and repose, and well earned for him the title of Adamantius. In correcting and polishing his works, Origen owns³ how much he was indebted to the kindness and liberality of Ambrose. Grateful for the benefit which he had received from Origen, he provided him with seven amanuenses: the genius and fluency of the philosopher being able to keep so

His labours.

¹ Photius calls him Theotechnus.

³ Epist. ad Afric. ad fin. (i. 29, f.)

² Euseb. H. E. vi. 19.—Laranda was a see of Lycaonia, near Derbe. Its Prelates sign in the first and fourth Œcumenical Councils. Synnada or Synnas was the metropolis of Phrygia Salutaris, and had Bishops as late, at least, as 1450.

Προσαγορεύει σε ὁ συναγωνισάμενος τῇ ὑπαγορεύσει τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ παρατυχὼν πάσῃ αὐτῇ, ἐν οἷς βεβούληται διορθωσάμενος, κύριός μου καὶ ἀδελφός ἱερὸς Ἀμβρόσιος, κ.τ.λ.

his friend-
ship with
Ambrose:

many employed. But, as it is well remarked by Baronius, "An inheritance may be gotten hastily in the beginning, but the end thereof shall not be blessed." If S. Jerome¹ and S. Ambrose were incapable of supplying sufficient work for one notary, the rapidity of Origen's conceptions must be allowed to have been full of danger: and the event proves that it was fraught with mischief. Ambrose provided the whole expenses which were necessary to enable Origen to carry on his studies: they were inseparable companions;² their meals were always improved by the reading of some grave work. Ambrose boldly confessed³ the faith of CHRIST; at what time is not ascertained: but incurred reproach after his death for not having in his will remembered Origen, whose poverty he must have well known.

Towards the end of the reign of Caracalla, Titus Flavius Clemens, commonly known as S. Clement of Alexandria, (though in truth he has no claim to the honour of canonization,⁴) rested from his labours. As a writer, we are hardly concerned with him, further than to observe that the errors and follies which, under Origen's name, distracted the Church, seem to have been to some extent a developement of Clement's teaching. Had we his Hypotyposes, we should be able to speak with more decision on this point. According to Photius, his doctrine in this work was heterodox in an almost incredible degree.

A.D. 217.
A.D. 218—
222.

The murder of Caracalla in Mesopotamia, and the rapid succession of Macrinus and Heliogabalus, gave the Church another interval of peace. Alexander, who was next elevated to the purple, was still more favourably disposed to the Christians, having, it is said, in his private oratory, among other images, those of Abraham and of the SAVIOUR.

he visits
Mammæa,

Shortly after the succession of Heliogabalus, Mammæa, the mother of Alexander, (whom Eusebius⁵ characterises as a most devout woman, if any ever deserved the title,) being at Antioch,

¹ S. Jerome, Comm. Galat. iii. Proem. 7, 485, 6. He graphically describes the inconvenience which was the result of the employment of an amanuensis.

² S. Hieron. Ep. ad Marc. i. 192.

³ S. Hieron. Catal. 57. (ii. 897.)

⁴ See this point discussed in the

learned Brief of Benedict XIV. prefixed to his Edition of the Roman Martyrology.

⁵ Euseb. H. E. vi. 21. So also S. Jerome speaks of her.—Catalog. 54. The question whether Mammæa was a Christian, is involved in great difficulties.—See Schröckh. C. K. G. iv. 6.

and having heard of Origen's great reputation, was desirous of conversing with him. She accordingly sent for him, and, accompanied by a guard of honour, he went to Antioch. He there discoursed at large on the verities of the Christian Faith, and, after some time, returned to Alexandria.

But in this season of tranquillity, heresy was busy : Tertullian had joined the Montanists, and his powerful eloquence was a loss to the Catholics not easily to be replaced. Greece, in particular, swarmed with heretics ; and the assistance of Origen was requested in exposing and refuting their statements. Illyria, the Diocese of which Greece was a part, was then in the Patriarchate of Rome, though afterwards transferred to that of Constantinople ; so that Origen's fame must have extended¹ far and wide, or an unordained member of a totally different Patriarchate would scarcely have been summoned. He requested leave from Demetrius, who not only consented, but gave him recommendatory letters, with which he passed into Palestine. In relating the difference which followed, a most undeserved imputation has been attached by ecclesiastical historians to the character of the Bishop of Alexandria. No sooner had Origen reached Cæsarea, than Theoctistus and Alexander, whom we have mentioned before, ordained him Priest. Demetrius was naturally indignant ; and if it had been kinder still to conceal Origen's early fault, we cannot wonder that the uncanonical nature of his ordination induced the Bishop to publish it, by way of proving it altogether irregular, and contrary to ecclesiastical discipline. For by the Apostolical Constitutions² it was forbidden to ordain such as Origen ; and the prohibition was repeated in the Council of Nicæa. Alexander, in reply, stated that his ground for ordaining Origen was the letter of recommendation which Demetrius himself had furnished. We are not informed of the rejoinder of the latter, but he might well have urged that his letters were given for the purpose of procuring a friendly reception for Origen, not to be used as passports to the Priesthood ; and that, although the Bishops of Palestine might not be aware of the canonical incapacity for ordination of him on whom they had laid their hands, Origen himself was,

goes into
Achaia ;

A.D. 228;
and is
ordained
Priest.

Demetrius
remon-
strates ;

¹ Rufinus, Vers. H. E. Euseb. vi. 23.

² App. Constt. Cann. 21, 22.

and had therefore incurred the triple fault of deceiving them, and acting contrary, in two particulars, to the Canon.

In the meantime, the cause of this dispute proceeded on his mission,¹ and having accomplished his work in Greece, returned by Ephesus² to Alexandria, hoping perhaps to find Demetrius more favourably disposed, and trusting to the influence of time in softening down his anger. If such were his hopes, they were fallacious. The Bishop retained an undiminished sense of his fault, and determined to take public notice of it. He assembled a Council, and laid before them not only the irregularity of Origen's Ordination, but a series of errors he banishes extracted from his writings. The latter must have presented a formidable appearance, as the works which he composed during his residence at Alexandria comprised his four books on Principles, known to us almost entirely through the translation of Rufinus, who has softened down some of the most obnoxious expressions; five books of his Commentary on S. John; eight of that on Genesis; an exposition of the first twenty-five Psalms, and of the Lamentations of Jeremiah; two books on the Resurrection, and ten of Stromateis, in imitation of those of his master Clement.³ The Council having examined the extracts submitted to it from the works of Origen,⁴ unanimously condemned them, and Demetrius not only forbade their author to teach, but even to reside, in Alexandria. Origen, leaving his school to the care of his disciple Heraclas, retired to Cæsarea. Demetrius shortly afterwards assembled another Council, in which, with the consent of the Bishops, he pro-

¹ S. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 64, (i. 524) relates the sufferings which Origen endured at Athens for the sake of the Truth, but immediately after invalidates his own testimony, by saying, that he was in that city for the sake of advancing himself in philosophy. As Origen was now more than forty, the latter assertion is impossible.

² So Huet, at least, very probably conjectures.—*Origeniana* i. 11, p. 89, D.

³ Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 24.

⁴ This part of Origen's history is unfortunately obscure, because Euse-

bis, instead of relating it at length, refers us to the second book of his *Apology* for that writer. All that we know is contained in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, and in a fragment of the defence of Origen by Pamphilus. Eusebius contradicts himself as to the time of Origen's flight from Alexandria; and Baronius, in noticing the discrepancy between his chronicle and his history, falls into the mistake of supposing that he was excommunicated before his departure.—See the able note of Valesius; Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26.

ceeded to the length of deposing and excommunicating Origen; and deposes Origen. Heraclas was present, and subscribed the sentence.

It is not wonderful that in later ages the traditions of the Alexandrine Church, as well Catholic as Jacobite, should have branded Origen with the title of magician. The Catholic writers of that country, not possessing his works, nor having been aware of the really great and excellent points in his character, knowing that S. Cyril, whose memory is deservedly precious among both the Orthodox and Monophysites, was a bitter enemy of both Origen and his followers, considering also the edict of Justinian, in which the latter were condemned, as possessing the same weight as the decree of an Œcumenical Council, have naturally loaded with every kind of calumny the memory of one whom they were thus from their births taught to hate, while Demetrius, his opponent, is reckoned among the Saints.

The days of this Prelate were now drawing to a close; and his last moments were embittered by the knowledge that his sentence of deposition and excommunication was disregarded by the Bishops of Palestine. By them Origen was, as before, invited to preach; his disciples were numerous: the most illustrious among them were Theodorus, afterwards known by the name of S. Gregory¹ the Wonderworker, from his astonishing miracles, and Tryphon² the philosopher.

Alexandrian writers affirm³ Demetrius to have been, in a supernatural degree, possessed of the power of knowing the hearts of those who came to the Holy Communion; and assert that an extraordinary degree of purity in his Church was the result. What is more certain is, that he wrote to the other Patriarchs on the Paschal computation; and, from his time, as some think,⁴ it became the office as the Nicene Council made it the duty of the Bishop of Alexandria, to give notice every year on what day Easter would fall. He is also said to have invented the system of Epacts.

Having governed his Church for more than forty-two years Death of S. Demetrius. and a half, a longer period than the Chair of S. Mark was ever

¹ S. Greg. Nyss. in vita S. Greg. Thaum.

³ Renaudot p. 20.

⁴ Eutychius i. 362.

² S. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. 57, (ii. 297.)

filled by one Prelate with the exception of S. Athanasius,¹ he was taken away from the evil to come, dying three years and a half before the commencement of the cruel persecution under Maximin.

SECTION IV.

Heracles,
Patr. XIII.
A.D. 231.*

renews the
sentence
against
Origen.

HERACLAS,² the former friend,³ and subsequent condemner of Origen, succeeded to the vacant chair. He appears to have been far advanced in years, and on that account transferred, not only the Christian school, but also the greater part of his Episcopal labours, to Dionysius, his successor.⁴ He renewed the sentence⁵ of excommunication against Origen; and in his Canons on Penance, inveighed severely against the intercourse which the Faithful carried on with proscribed heretics; among whom probably the Origenians were uppermost in his mind. Whether it were either wise or justifiable to pursue the system of Demetrius, and thus to hazard a schism between the Sees of Cæsarea and Alexandria, appears very questionable; the rather that Origen was now, by the testimony of all, exerting himself greatly for the faith. Besides carrying on his Commentaries on the Old Testament, he was labouring at his parallel arrangements of Greek versions with the Hebrew text. In

¹ Among the Jacobite Patriarchs, John XVII., surnamed El Touki, enjoyed that dignity for forty-three years and two months, namely, from 1675 till 1718. And Politian, the thirty-ninth Catholic Patriarch, is said by Eutychius, though probably by mistake, to have held it forty-six years.—See Book iii. sect. 6.

² Euseb. H. E. vi. 26.

³ Severus names this Patriarch, Hierocla; Eutychius, Hercol; Makrizi, Theoclas:—our Coptic Catalogue, Barchelas.

⁴ Baronius asserts (ii. 558,) that Heraclas was well disposed towards Origen. The contrary is shewn to have been the case by Pagi, in the same place, and Huet. Origen. i. 2, 15,

from the testimony of Gennadius, and the author of the Life of S. Pachomius. Indeed Baronius himself confesses as much, in quoting the constitution of the Emperor Justinian against Origen, addressed to Menas, ix. 585.

⁵ So Justinian: (Conf. Labbé's Councils: tom. v. 660.—'Ο κατ' ἐκείνο μακαρίτης Ἡρακλᾶς . . . ἐκ μέσου τοῦ καλοῦ σίτου τοῦτον ἐξέτιλεν, ὡς τοῦ πονηροῦ ζιζανίου ὄντα ἀληθῶς.—And in the Life of S. Pachomius: (Acta Bolland. Mai. tom. iii. ad finem.) 'Υπὸ Ἡρακλᾶ τοῦ τῆς Αλεξανδρείας ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐβρίφη.

* The date of this event is attended with great difficulties.—See Le Quien, ii. 391, 2; Baron. ii. 519, 1; Pagi, *ibid*; Scherius, p. 20.

his Octapla were eight columns, arranged thus:—the Hebrew The Octapla. in Hebrew characters; the same in Greek characters; the version of Aquila; that of Symmachus; that of the Seventy; that of Theodotion; and finally two other versions discovered by Origen himself, called the *Fifth* and *Sixth*, because their authors were unknown. The Hexapla omitted the *Fifth* and *Sixth* versions; the Tetrapla, also the two Hebrew texts. On this work the compiler was engaged twenty-eight years. He also was the means of crushing in its infancy the heresy of of Beryllus, Bishop of Bostra in Arabia, and of bringing back its author to the True Faith. He taught that our SAVIOUR had not existed as a separate¹ and self-existent Person before the Incarnation.

But Heraclas was soon called upon to set an example to A.D. 235. his flock of courage and resolution. Alexander having been murdered in his tent by the gigantic and brutal Maximin, was succeeded by him. This Goth,² having discovered a conspiracy formed against him by the servants of the late emperor, among whom were several Christians, took thence occasion to commence a general persecution, which is reckoned as the Seventh; Persecution of Maximin: it was, however, not so sanguinary as many. It was principally directed against the Bishops and Priests; and it appears that Heraclas,³ to avoid its fury, retired from Alexandria. Several inhabitants, however, both of that city, and of other parts of Egypt, glorified God by their sufferings in it. On its cessation, Heraclas returned to the city. Whether it were now, or at an earlier period, that the fame of his learning induced the Ecclesiastical writer, Julius Africanus,⁴ to visit Alexandria, is not certain;

¹ Fleury says (vi. 12,) “et qu’Il n’avoit point d’autre divinité que celle du Père Qui habitoit en Lui.” This is, thus stated, (and it is a fair translation of the words of Eusebius, ἐμπολιτευομένην Αὐτῷ μόνην τὴν Πατρικήν) a Catholic verity; and to maintain the opposite doctrine is Tritheism. But, if Beryllus were heretical on this point, it was by teaching that the SON was not properly, but only appellatively and participatively God. In his other

assertion, that our LORD had not pre-existed, κατ’ ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν, or, as it would have been expressed at a later period, κατ’ ἰδίαν ὑποστάσεως περιγραφὴν, where περιγραφὴ is, as Valesius proves, to be taken in the logical sense of *differentia*, he is undoubtedly heretical.

² By his *mother’s* side he was of the Alan nation, which was of the Slavonic family.

³ Ruinart, Act. Sinc. 41.

⁴ Euseb. H. E. vi. 31.

whenever the event took place, it is a strong testimony to the merits of Heraclas, because Africanus was the friend of Origen.

Alexandria was fortunately no sufferer in the civil commotions which followed; the Gordians appeared as claimants of the purple in Africa, and lost their lives in the attempt; Puppianus and Balbinus assumed it, with brighter auspices, at Rome, and the head of Maximin was sent by his soldiers, engaged in the siege of Aquileia, as an acceptable present to the Senate. But the Capitoline games put an end to the lives and reigns of emperors in whose election the army had had no voice; and the young Gordian, a mere child, who had been previously made Cæsar to gratify the people, succeeded. In an expedition against the Persians, Philip, Prefect of the Prætorians, excited the soldiery against him, and in spite of his earnest entreaties for a share in the empire,—for the title of Cæsar,—for the Prefecture of the Prætorians,—for the government of a Province,—and lastly for life, caused him to be murdered, and assumed the purple.

Philip,
Emperor.

Heraclas did not long survive this event; he was removed from his labours after having governed the See of Alexandria more than fifteen years.¹ The Egyptian writers, having nothing authentic to tell of him, are reduced to put forth fables; as that he was the first Bishop of Alexandria to whom the title of Pope was given; whereas the mere student of Ecclesiastical History knows it to have been in use long before the time of Heraclas; and, originally, to have applied even to Priests,—and to have been of common use as regards Bishops.² Again, it is affirmed

¹ Euseb. H. E. vi. 35, says sixteen: but he must be understood to mean part of sixteen, or fifteen complete: in the same way as where he mentions forty-three years as the period of the Episcopate of Demetrius, he must be understood to mean more than forty-two.—Le Quien, ii. 393.

² Tertullian's testimony (*de Pudicit.* cap. xiii.) is clear: so are the superscriptions of many letters to S. Cyprian: even by the confession of Pamelius and Rigaltius. To this day, the Alexandrian Church, both Coptic and Catholic, uses it; so does the

Ethiopian; so also the Syrians term the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, and the Catholic or Mafrian of Assyria. Eutychius's account of the origin of the name at Alexandria is as follows (i. 332):—One of the twenty Bishops whom Heraclas created, named Ammonius, having in some manner transgressed the Canons, the Patriarch visited his Diocese, to restore order. The people heard their Bishops address him as Abba, father, and reasoned thus: If we call the Bishop Father, and he calls Heraclas Father, then the Patriarch must be our grand-

that he created twenty new sees, a thing most unlikely, since it is hardly probable that in his short patriarchate he should even have consecrated that number of Bishops. Of his penitential Canons, once, particularly those on conversation with heretics, of considerable reputation, nothing remains at this day.

As Origen will scarcely again appear in our pages, and as his teaching and his influence operated, both for good and for evil, on the Alexandrian Church long after his decease, it will not be out of place to touch a little on his doctrine and opinions, the rather because disputes to which they gave rise will hereafter occupy our attention. He is to be judged not by his earlier writings, nor by his familiar communications to friends; not by the interpretation of his enemies, nor as an author, the whole of whose teaching we possess; but by the works of his matured judgment, and which he himself intended for publication. Again, writing before the Council of Nicæa, he is not to be hastily condemned, should some of his statements appear to differ verbally from the Confession of the Three Hundred and Eighteen: provided it shall appear that, allowing his words that fair latitude of expression which will be conceded to them by all unprejudiced readers, they are not opposed to its meaning. How successfully Bishop Bull has vindicated the memory of Origen from the imputation of heresy, so far as regards the Divinity of the SON of GOD, the English scholar needs not to be told. He might, perhaps, have rendered his apology still more triumphant, (though not more convincing,) had he confined himself less entirely to the Reply to Celsus, allowedly the most satisfactory of Origen's remaining works.

Origen's
writings:
how to be
judged;

His express and formal statements on the Mystery of the Adorable TRINITY are not to be set aside by expressions of a more ambiguous character, and phrases which, in themselves, might receive a heterodox interpretation. That Joshua, in pass-

father, *Baba*; whence Papa. Makrizi (65, 66,) repeats the tale with variations. This is at least equal in probability to the hypothesis of those who derive the Roman name Papa from *Pater Patriæ*, or from *Paulus* and *Petrus*. It is singular

that Balsamon, so strenuous a defender of Oriental rights, should affirm (*Jus. Gr. Lat.* lib. vii.) that this title was bestowed by the Roman See on S. Cyril, when acting as its Legate in the Council of Ephesus.

his clear
statements
of the
Divinity of
the SON of
God :

ing the Jordan, was a type of the very God¹; that the rulers, on account of the Divinity² of JESUS, offered their supplications to Him; that the same CHRIST That spake with the woman³ by the well, was the GOD of the humble; that it was the SON of GOD That said, No man shall see My Face, and live⁴; that His also are the words to be considered, If I am a Master, where is My fear?⁵—words which the prophet ascribes to none other than JEHOVAH;—that CHRIST is GOD, the SON of GOD,⁶ the Very Word, the Very Wisdom, the Very Verity; that he who shall say, There was a time when the Word was not,⁷ says in effect, There was a time when Wisdom was not, Truth was not, Life was not; that if the SON of GOD were not Eternal,⁸ neither could the FATHER be Eternal; that the Magi brought gifts to Him⁹ That was composed of GOD and mortal man; that GOD appeared in a human body for the benefit of our race¹⁰; that GOD, Who is above all created things,¹¹ was made man; that the FATHER and the SON are One¹² in identity of Will; that all things that are in the

¹ Hom. de Engastrimytho (ii. 497, E.)
Πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
ἐπιδημίας ἀδύνατον ἦν τινα παρελθεῖν
κ.τ.λ. ὥσπερ τὸν Ἰορδάνην οὐκ ἦν
οὐδενὸς ὁδοποιῆσαι ἢ Ἰησοῦ (τοῦ
ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ τύπος ἦν ἐκεῖνος Ἰησοῦς.)
κ.τ.λ.

² In S. Joan. tom. xiii. 58 (iv. 274, A.) Τῶν ἀρχόντων τινὰς, καταπεπληγότας τὴν δύναμιν Αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν Θεοτῆτα, προσπεφευγένοι Αὐτῷ.

³ In S. Joan. tom. xiii. 28, (iv. 238, A.B.) The passage is too long for quotation.

⁴ In S. Matt. tom. xii. 43, (iii. 565, C.) Τὸν Ἰδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ κεχρηματικέναι Μωσεῖ, καὶ Αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐρηκότα· Οὐ γὰρ ὕψεται ἄνθρωπος. κ.τ.λ.

⁵ In S. Joan. tom. i. 31 (iv. 33, B.) Εἰ Κόριός εἰμι· Ἐγὼ, ποῦ, κ.τ.λ. Δούλοι τυγχάνουσι Κυρίου τοῦ Σωτῆρος αὐτῶν καλουμένου.

⁶ Cont. Celsum. iii. 41. (i. 474, A.) Ἐὺν πεπεσμεθα ἀρχῆθεν εἶναι Θεὸν καὶ Ἰδὸν Θεοῦ, Ἀδτος ὁ Αὐτολόγος ἐστι καὶ ἡ Αὐτοσοφία καὶ ἡ Αὐτοαληθεία.

⁷ Peri Archon, iv. 28. (i. 190, E.) Quomodo ergo potest dici, quia fuit aliquando quando non fuit Filius? Nihil enim aliud est id dicere, nisi fuit aliquando quando Veritas non erat, quando Sapientia non erat, quando Vita non erat.

⁸ See the famous passage, In Jerem. Hom. ix. 4, (iii. 181.)

⁹ Cont. Celsum. i. 60, (i. 375, A.) Δῶρα δ', ἢν οὕτως ὀνομάσω, συνθέτω· Τινὲ ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου θνητοῦ προσήνεγκαν.

¹⁰ Cont. Celsum. i. 68, (i. 383, D.) Πῶς ἐβλόγοι ἂν τις Αὐτόν . . . μὴ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ [Θεοῦ]—for so it seems best to read with later Editors,—Θεὸν εἶναι πιστεύει ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ φανέντα σώματι ἐπ' ἐνεργεσίᾳ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν;

¹¹ In S. Joan. tom. ii. 28, (iv. 87, B.) Θεὸς, ὁ ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ γενητὰ, ἐνηνθρόπησεν.

¹² Cont. Celsum. viii. 12, (i. 751, A.) Ἐν τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλείματος.

FATHER¹ are in the SON;—these clear and definite assertions cannot be overthrown by teaching of more dubious orthodoxy. So that we shall endeavour to explain, or adopt in their most orthodox sense, such expressions² as, that the operation of the FATHER extends to all things; that of the SON, as less than the FATHER, to such as are rational only; that of the HOLY GHOST, as less than the SON, to such as are holy only; as, again, that the SON³ is a Second GOD; that the Word, compared with the FATHER, is not the Truth,⁴ but compared with us, the Image only of the Truth; that the SON⁵ is not the Most High GOD over all; that the FATHER, and not the SON,⁶ is to be addressed in prayer; that the FATHER and the SON are hypostatically Two,⁷ it being usual, in the time of Origen, to use hypostasis in the sense of substance.

Again, with respect to the Divinity of the HOLY GHOST, the statements of Origen are, in many places, clearly and formally orthodox. If the soul,⁸ he writes, have not GOD, if it have not the SON, saying, I and the FATHER will come unto him, and make Our abode in him, if it have not the HOLY GHOST, that soul is deserted; but it is inhabited when it is full of GOD. The Jews, he says, appeared to thirst after GOD, the only Fountain of Waters, but because they thirsted not after CHRIST and the HOLY GHOST, neither can they drink of GOD.⁹ In like manner he speaks of the TRINITY That rules all things,¹⁰ the TRINITY That is to be adored¹¹: and yet, in other places, he seems, as we have seen above, to deny the co-equality of the HOLY SPIRIT with the FATHER.

of the
Divinity of
the HOLY
GHOST;

¹ In Jerem. Hom. viii. 2, (iii. 171, C.) Πάντα γὰρ ὅσα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοιαῦτα ἐν αὐτῷ ἔστιν.

² Peri Archon, i. 5, (i. 62, D. E.) This is one of the passages that Rufinus softened down, and indeed totally changed; but it is preserved at the end of the Epistle of Justinian to Menas.

³ Cont. Celsum. v. 39, (i. 608, D. E.)

⁴ S. Hieronym. ad Avit. Ep. 59.

⁵ Cont. Celsum. viii. 714, (i. 752, D.) Ἔστω δέ τις . . . ὑποτίθεται τὸν Σωτῆρα εἶναι τὸν μέγιστον ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεόν· ἀλλ' οὐτι γὰρ ἡμεῖς τοιοῦτον.

⁶ Cont. Celsum. viii. 13 et seq.

⁷ Cont. Celsum. viii. 12, (i. 751, A.)

⁸ In Jerem. Hom. viii. 1, (iii. 170, C.)

⁹ In Jerem. Hom. xvii. 9, (iii. 251, E.) Ἔδοξαν δεδιψηκέναι μίαν πηγῆς τῶν ὕδατων, τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ἰουδαῖοι· ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐκ ἐδίψησαν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, οὐκ ἔχουσι πλεῖν οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

¹⁰ Ἀρχικὴν.—In S. Matt. tom. xv. 31, (iii. 698, B.)

¹¹ Προσκυνητήν.—In S. Joan. tom. vi. 17, (iv. 133, C.)

On the subject of the Incarnation, Origen's doctrine can hardly be accused of heresy; and if exposed to a charge of error, it is easy to explain how that error arose, and to define how far it extends. That the Word, Consubstantial with God, as touching Deity, is Consubstantial¹ with man as touching humanity,—that the Hypostatical Union² is everlasting,—that the Two Natures yet remain unmixed and unconfounded; that CHRIST really and verily died,³ really and verily ascended into Heaven in our flesh, and in our flesh sitteth at the Right Hand of God;—these things are almost as clearly asserted by Origen, as by S. Cyril or S. Leo. His occasional obscurity and appearance of heterodoxy arises from his belief in the pre-existence of souls; whence it followed, in his judgment, that there was an union of the Word with the human soul, before the union of the Word with the body. This doctrine, though erroneous, is not heretical; for Origen most carefully guards himself against appearing to teach that there was a time when the Soul of CHRIST was not hypostatically united to the Divine Word: nay, he clearly deduces⁴ Its sanctity and impeccability from that perpetual hypostatical union.

But the warmest admirers of Origen must be contented if they can vindicate him from the charge of grave heresy; for the errors and absurdities which abound in his earlier writings, and more especially in his treatise *Peri Archon*, are too manifest to be denied, and too gross to be excused. That God created in the beginning a certain number of pure spirits, capable of retaining their original holiness, but also capable of falling,—that the greater part of these spirits actually have fallen,—that according to their degrees of guilt they were punished by being united to matter more or less gross,—that accordingly some became angels, some stars, and others men; that the Blessed are still exposed to the liability of sin, and that, on the other hand, Satan will one day repent and be pardoned, so that God shall be All in All:—these are but some of the many doctrines which, however hypothetically proposed, have rendered

¹ Cont. Celsum. vi. 47, (i. 669, E.)

³ Cont. Celsum. 56 (i. 430, E.)

² *Peri Archon*, ii. 6, 3, (i. 90, B.)

Deinceps inseparabiliter Ei et indissociabiliter inherens.

⁴ *Peri Archon*, ii. 6, 6, (i. 91, A.)

the authority of Origen so small, and have exposed him to suspicion of, and condemnation for, heresy in matters of graver import.

It is a curious, and not unprofitable, inquiry, in what degree, and to what effect, the authority of Origen influenced the subsequent history of the Alexandrian Church. Notwithstanding his general condemnation, in after ages, both by East and West, and the more particular odium which attached to his name in Egypt, his influence, (or rather that of his school,) pervaded the Church of that country in a manner of which, at the time, his adversaries and his supporters were alike unconscious. In reading the works of Origen, we are not to consider his tenets and opinions as those of one isolated Doctor;—they are rather an embodiment of the doctrines handed down in the Catechetical School of Alexandria. And this school was the type, or model, according to which the mind of the Alexandrian Church was cast: the philosophy of Pantæus descended to Clemens,—and from him it was caught by Origen. Heraclas, though opposed to the principles of the latter, gave evident tokens of having unconsciously imbibed them:—and, still later, Pierius was known as the second Origen.

Influence of the spirit of the Alexandrian School

The truth is, that in every people there is a national tendency to carry certain doctrines to an extreme length: an hereditary predisposition, so to speak, to a particular heresy. Thus, the English Church has, from its earliest infancy, evinced a tendency to Pelagianism, and the Ethiopic to Judaism. Now, the two great forms into which heresy has divided itself in all ages, have been rationalism, and that which, for want of a better term, we may call spiritualism, or mysticism. Under the former division we may class Arianism, and Nestorianism; under the latter, Sabellianism, Monophysitism, and Monothelitism. To the one, the Church of Antioch was given from the earliest times; to the other, that of Alexandria. Now of this class was the mind of Origen, the mortal enemy of rationalism, and of all the heresies springing up from it. And Egypt never gave way to any such: and from Egypt arose the Doctors by whom they were overthrown: Arianism by S. Athanasius, Nestorianism by S. Cyril. But to mysticism it fell an easy prey. The head-quarters of Sabellianism were fixed in

displayed in the tendency of the Alexandrian Church to mysticism.

the Pentapolis ; and S. Dionysius, who first exposed that heresy, was not an Egyptian by birth or education. But when, in that exposure, he himself appeared to rationalise, his Diocese was up in arms against the innovation in doctrine. Again :—we may wonder that Apollinaris, the forerunner of Eutychianism, should have risen in Syria, till we remember that his father, the elder Apollinaris, was born and bred in Alexandria. In the same manner Alexandria yielded to the teaching of Dioscorus ; while that heresy as well as Monothelitism was first detected and exposed in the rationalistic city of Constantinople.

It is therefore certain, that the same principle which dictated the Angelic theories of Origen, gave birth to the subtle heresy of the Jacobites, and the still more refined poison of Monothelitism. But it is also true that the same tendency, subject in this instance to Catholic authority, produced a S. Athanasius and a S. Cyril. The tendency, in itself, one way or the other, is neither good nor bad ; the greatest saints have given proofs of sharing it. S. Chrysostom could not have been a Monophysite, nor S. Cyril a Nestorian.

Nor is it any objection to urge, that the doctrine of Origen has been accused of Arianism, but never of Sabellianism, and that it was actually appealed to by the Arians in defence of their tenets. It is the property of heresy, that apparently opposing forms should be, in the long run, identical. Thus, nothing can, at first sight, seem more directly contrary to Arianism than Nestorianism ; yet, in truth, the result of both is the same.—And, indeed, there are passages in the writings of Origen, of an apparently¹ Sabellian tendency, which have not received the consideration, nor been thought worthy of the explanation, that they merit.

In short, Origen's claim to orthodoxy will probably remain an enigma until the end of all things. He can hardly be accused of heresy whom S. Athanasius, S. Basil, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Hilary, S. Ambrose, and S. Gregory Nyssen, have defended ;—he can hardly be acquitted of it whom so many synods, if not a General Council, have condemned.

¹ Cont. Celsum. vi. 64. (i. 681, D.) In Jerem. Hom. xix. 1. (iii. 262, A.)

SECTION V.

THE DECIAN PERSECUTION AND ITS RESULTS.

IF we may believe the Egyptian writers, Dionysius, who had for some time past performed the duties of the Episcopate, and who now succeeded to its possession, had been brought up a Pagan, and was¹ deeply skilled in astrology. It happened that the Epistles of S. Paul were one day lent to him by a poor woman who had embraced the True Faith; and a perusal of them induced him not only to purchase the volume, but to make inquiry whether the Christians were in possession of other works that bore a similar character. The woman advised him to apply to the Priests of the Church; and, on his complying with her advice, the books which they lent, and the instructions which they gave him, were made the means of his conversion.

S. Dionysius,
Patr. XIV.
A.D. 247*

His conver-
sion,

The new Bishop, a Sabaite by birth, that is,² as appears probable, an Arabian, was a man of good family,³ but an idolater. On his conversion he studied under Origen, for whom⁴ he always

¹ Renaudot, p. 25, who seems, in the next page, by mistake to attribute this tradition to Heraclas.

² See Byæus, § 28, Comm. Præv. in Vit. S. Dionys. (October, Bolland. ii.) But the author of his life, prefixed to the beautiful Propaganda edition of his Fragments, strenuously controverts this opinion, and affirms the author of the Chronicon Orientale to have meant nothing but *Pagan* by the term Sabaite.

³ Ruinart, Act. Sinc. pp. 179, 80, (ed. 2, which we always quote.)

⁴ It is said indeed that he had written a treatise against Origen, (Anastasius, Quæst. sup. Genes. 25,) but this writer must confuse some other Dionysius with the Bishop of Alexandria. Baronius has fallen into the mistake of supposing the latter opposed to Origen: the contrary is shewn by Pagi, 246, iii. iv.; Halloix, Orig. Def. i. 22; and Huet, Origeniana, i. 3, 10.

* There is a great difficulty with respect to this date. Sollerius gives 248 as the year of the accession of S. Dionysius: and to this end he supposes with the Chronicon Orientale a vacancy of the Patriarchate for a year and some months. Byæus seems more probably to assert that S. Dionysius was consecrated in or about the February of A.D. 247:—and deceased in that month, or the preceding, of A.D. 265. Thus he would have sat only seventeen years *complete*, as Eusebius, (H. E. vii. 28,) says, and would also have assumed the Episcopate in the third year of Philip, as Eusebius (H. E. vi. 35) also testifies; which third year ended in March, 247. It is not probable, as Byæus observes, that in a time of peace, as the reign of Philip was, the See of Alexandria should have remained so long vacant.

love to
Origen,
retained a sincere attachment. At a later period, he addressed to him, when suffering for the Faith of CHRIST, a consolatory treatise ;—thus repaying to him the same comfort that he had so often given to others. On the death of Origen, Dionysius addressed an eulogy on his character to that Theoctistus,¹ Bishop of Cæsarea, whom we have already had occasion to notice.

learning,
Dionysius was a man of universal learning ; and the first of those great Fathers by whom the throne of Alexandria was rendered so illustrious. As, like all the Masters of the Catechetical school, he had joined the study of philosophy to that of Theology, he was the means of bringing many Pagans to a knowledge of the Truth ; and he was particularly conversant with the writings of heretics, and had an inexhaustible treasure of arguments against their various perversions of the truth.

application
to polemical
Divinity.
“I was at considerable pains,” he says² in an epistle to Philemon, “in reading the books and acquainting myself with the traditions of the heretics. I thus, for the moment, polluted my soul with their most vile devices ; but I obtained this advantage from them,—the confuting them in my own mind, and the abominating them much more than I had previously done. There was a certain brother among the presbyters who was for hindering me from this practice ; and who feared that I should be contaminated³ with the same pollution of wickedness. My own mind, he said, would be injured ; and I thought that he was speaking the truth. A vision, however, sent from God, came and confirmed me ; and a word spoken to me expressly commanded me thus : ‘ Study every thing that shall come into thine hands ; for thou art capable of examining and proving all things ; and this habit of reading was, at the beginning, the occasion even of thy believing.’ I received the vision, as consonant with the apostolic exhortation to them that have powerful minds, —*Be ye wise⁴ bankers.*”

¹ Photius, Cod. ccxxxii.—This epistle is there said to be addressed to Theoctenus : but this Theoctistus must be meant, and not Theoctenus, who was his second successor. For Theoctistus survived Origen some time. Compare Le Quien, iii. 543 ; and Valesius on Eusebius, vii. 1.

² Preserved by Eusebius, H.E. vii. 7.

³ We read, in Valesius’s very elegant conjecture, *συμφύρεσθαι*. Heinichen, however, retains *συμφέρεσθαι*, the reading of all the MSS. ; which must then be taken in the sense of *being carried away with*.

⁴ These words are affirmed by Origen, (in S. Joan. tom. x.) and after him by S. Jerome in his Epistle

On his accession to the Episcopate, he resigned the charge of the school into the hands of Clemens, the second Master of that name. It would appear that, before his consecration,¹ Dionysius had been married.

Philip is believed to have been a Christian, at least in creed; the means by which he attained the Empire shew him to have been entirely uninfluenced by the spirit of the True Faith. But the Church, with a single exception, enjoyed a profound repose during the whole of his reign;—that single exception occurred in Alexandria. In the winter of A.D. 249, the populace were excited against the Christians by a man, who united the professions of poet² and soothsayer. The particulars of the persecution are preserved in an epistle written by Dionysius to Fabius³ of Antioch.

Local Persecution at Alexandria:

Metras,⁴ an aged man, was the first victim. The populace seized him, and insisted on his blaspheming CHRIST; on his refusal, they fell upon him with clubs, tore his face and eyes with sharp reeds, cast him out of Alexandria, and stoned him. A few days after they drew a woman named Quinta into a temple, and on her refusing with horror to adore the idol which

Martyrdom of S. Metras.

S. Quinta,

to Minervius and Alexander, to have been spoken by CHRIST: so too by S. Epiphanius, Hær. xlv. It is also quoted as from S. Paul. Other Fathers are quoted by Cotelierius, on the Apostolic Constitutions, ii. 36. Three opinions have been put forward on the subject:—The first is that of Usher, (Proleg. ad S. Ignat. Epp. cap. 8,) Valesius, Huet, Salmasius, (de Fœnore Trapez. 809,) and Fabricius, (Cod. Apoc. N. T. i. 330,) that the words in question are taken from the Apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews. The second, that of Suicer, Thes. Eccl. ii. p. 1283; with whom the modern German School of Critics, e. g. Paulus on S. Luke xix. 23, appears to agree: that the sentence is adapted from the Parable of the Talents, or from 1 Thessalon. v. 21, or from a comparison of both passages. The third is that of Cotelierius, that the words were really those of the

SAVIOUR, and were handed down by tradition.—And this appears the most probable supposition.

¹ Byæus, — (October, Bolland. ii. 17,)—tries hard to evade the force of Tillemont's arguments, and with Valesius, to prove the Bishop unmarried. But the plain sense of the Patriarch's own expressions (Euseb. H. E. vi. 40) seems to shew the contrary.

² Ὁ κακῶν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ μάντις καὶ ποιητής, says S. Dionysius. We follow Valesius in taking the words literally. Others, as Pearson in his Ann. Cyp. ccxlix. § 1, understand the meaning to be, a doer of evil to this city in past times, and a kind of prophet as to those that were coming upon it under Decius.

³ Euseb. H. E. vi. 41.

⁴ There was a church dedicated in his honour at Alexandria.—Ruinart, Act. Sinc. 124.

it contained, they bound her by the feet, dragged her over the rough pavement of the city to the place where S. Metras had suffered, and stoned her. This second martyrdom was the signal for a general attack on the Christians. Their houses were assaulted; their goods thrown into the street and burnt; themselves insulted, and forced either to hide themselves or to leave the city. Dionysius escaped unharmed; and had to bewail the apostasy of but one from his flock. S. Apollonia, who had devoted herself to virginity, and had attained a great age, was seized by the Pagans, who, after brutally striking her on the face till her teeth fell out, threatened her with being burnt alive, having lighted a fire for the purpose, unless she would praise the gods. She appeared to hesitate, and the persecutors imagining themselves successful, loosed her; but she only availed herself of freedom to shew her constancy and courage, by entering of her own accord the blazing pile. They then beset the house of Serapion, attacked him as he sat by his own hearth, tortured him in a fearful manner, and having broken all his bones, carried him to the roof of the house, and thence threw him into the street. No street nor lane could be passed in safety; bands of infuriated Pagans paraded every public place, compelling those whom they met to blaspheme CHRIST, or burning their houses and torturing their persons. All these Martyrs are by the Western, as well as the Eastern Church, reckoned among the Saints.

A.D. 249. This persecution seems to have lasted for nearly six months, and to have been put a stop to for a brief season by the murder of Philip, at Verona. He was succeeded by Decius, elevated to the purple in Pannonia. Immediately on his accession, the eighth persecution began; it was more terrible than any, excepting the last, and the most successful of all. For, in the interval of peace which the Church had enjoyed, faith and love had begun to wax cold; worldliness and self-indulgence had crept in; and this to such a degree, that some of the holier Bishops gave warning, while all was yet tranquil, of the storm about to burst forth, and which they saw to be necessary for the purification of the Church.

The account which Eusebius gives us of the sufferings of the Christians at Alexandria, is the more valuable, as being extracted from the letters of Dionysius himself, fragments of which are

preserved both by that historian and by S. Jerome. They were addressed, when the Church had regained her tranquillity, to Fabius, Patriarch of Antioch, Didymus, Domitius, and others.

On the first tidings of the persecution, the consternation in Alexandria was dreadful. Some of those who had previously made a high profession, ran voluntarily to the altars, exclaiming that they had never been Christians, and sacrificing with alacrity; others, urged on by their neighbours, came with pale countenances and trembling limbs, amidst the jeers and mockery of the heathen, who evidently perceived them to be almost equally afraid of living by sin, or dying in torments. Others confessed the name of CHRIST before the magistrate, were thrown into prison, and after a few days' endurance, apostatized; others, after resisting the torture for some time, yielded to it, and offered sacrifice.

S. Dionysius gives us an account of what befel himself, pre-facing his statement with an appeal to GOD that his story is exactly true. The Edict for persecution had no sooner reached Alexandria, than Sabinus, Augustal Præfect, dispatched a sergeant of police in search of the Prelate. The Bishop remained quietly in his house; while the party of soldiers sought him for four days, in every unlikely place, roads, rivers, and fields; but, by a divine infatuation, never thought of searching the Bishop's own habitation. On the fifth day, Dionysius received a supernatural intimation to fly; he was accompanied by his children and several of his priests. During his journey, he was made useful to some of his flock; probably in confirming their minds, and alleviating their fears.

At sunset, however, the Bishop¹ fell into the hands of his persecutors; and, it being then not more than five or six o'clock, was examined before the magistrates, and sentenced to exile at Taposiris. This was a little city in Marcotis, about a day's journey from Alexandria. A priest named Timothy, who is by some believed to have been the Bishop's son, was absent when Dionysius left his house; on returning there towards evening, he found the place occupied by soldiers, and learnt that the

¹ The account of S. Dionysius is involved in many difficulties. Byæus, cap. v. has taken great pains in unraveling it, and we have followed his hypothesis.

Prelate had been sent to Taposiris. After hearing these tidings, he took the road to Marcotis, and the anguish that he felt was sufficiently displayed in his countenance. A countryman, whom he met, inquired the cause of his agitation. On learning the misfortune that had befallen Dionysius, the man, then going to a nuptial feast, at that time carried on through the whole night, hastened to the house where the banquet was prepared, and stated the circumstance to the assembled guests. They arose as one man, laid hands on what they could find as instruments of defence, and assaulted the house where the Bishop was confined. *and rescued.* The guard took them for banditti, and dispersed. Dionysius, who had retired to rest, was at first under the same mistake, and pointing to his clothes, bade them take all he had, and begone. When he discovered their real design, and perceived that they were bent on his liberation, he refused to stir; and besought them, if they were really willing to do him a service, to rid his guards of any further trouble, by cutting off his head. It was in vain that they prayed and conjured him to have pity, if not on his own life, at least on the state of his Church; he remained inflexible. They at length had recourse to actual violence; and raising him forcibly from his bed, carried him off. All those who had been with him followed; he made choice of two only, Peter and Caius, to be his companions, and with them retired into the desert till the violence of the persecution should have exhausted itself.

Martyrdom
of S. Julian,

In the meantime its fury was unabated. Julian,¹ an aged Christian, an inhabitant of Alexandria, was summoned to the tribunal. He was so much tormented by the gout, as to be unable to walk without the support of two assistants, and leaning on their shoulders he appeared before the judge. One of them, at the first sight of the terrible preparations, lost courage, and apostatised; the other, whose name was Cronion, but who was surnamed Eunus, together with Julian, witnessed a good confession. They were bound on camels, scourged through the whole extent of the city, and burnt alive without the gate. As they were passing to the pile, amidst the insults of the populace, a soldier named Besas protected them to the utmost of his ability;

S. Besas,

¹ Euseb. vi. 41.—There was also a church at Alexandria, under the invocation of this martyr, which was restored by S. Eulogius. Ruinart, 126.

and the rabble, enraged, cried out that he deserved the same fate. He was taken before the judge; confessed himself a Christian, and was beheaded. It does not appear that he received the Sacrament of Baptism; supplied to him, in this case, according to the belief of the early Church, by the Baptism of Blood whereof he was counted worthy. Macar, a Libyan, and S. Macar, worthy, says S. Dionysius, of his name (which signifies blessed), was burnt alive. By the same means Epimachus and Alexander, after enduring a tedious imprisonment, the torture of the iron hooks, and scourging, were called to receive their crown. Dionysia, the mother of several children, was among the Mar- S. Dionysia, tyrs; Ammonarium, a virgin, having declared her resolution, at the commencement of her examination, not to utter a word, was tormented long and cruelly, but without flinching from her determination. Mercuria also, and another Ammonarium, wit- and others. nessed a good confession. The judge, mortified to be thus baffled by women, contented himself with causing the other prisoners of the same sex to be beheaded. Heron, Ater, and Isidorus, died gloriously for the Name of CHRIST. Dioscorus, Confession of S. Dioscorus. a youth of fifteen years old, was brought before the magistrate in company with these elder Christians. Thinking that his tender age would make life the sweeter, and death the bitterer, the judge addressed him kindly; failing in this, he tried torture with as little effect; he then caused the three others to be tormented and finally burnt; and afterwards renewed his offers to Dioscorus, hoping that the sight of the sufferings of his friends might overcome his obstinacy. At length he ordered him to be set at liberty, giving him time, he said, to reconsider the subject; and the youth retired to Dionysius in the wilderness. Nemesion was at first accused of robbery; having repelled that charge, he was denounced as a Christian; tortured twice as much as the robbers with whom he was tried; and finally burnt with them. A short time afterwards four soldiers, and another Christian, came before the præfect; a prisoner was at that moment undergoing the torture, and his resolution was evidently failing. Advancing to a spot where he could see them, the soldiers made signs to the sufferer to hold out but for a few moments longer, and so secure his reward. The bystanders regarded them with astonishment;

but before any accusation was brought against them, they voluntarily came forward, and professed themselves Christians. Wearied out with cruelty, and terrified at the wide spread of Christianity, the præfect ordered them to immediate execution; and they were hurried to it, exhibiting tokens of the liveliest joy.

Confessors
in Egypt.

But those who suffered at Alexandria were by no means the whole of the Egyptian believers who laid down their lives for the Faith. Many were torn in pieces by popular violence in the other cities; many fled to the mountains, and there perished with hunger and thirst, cold and weariness; many fell into the hands of the Arabians, and were reduced to slavery; many made their escape, but were never afterwards heard of. Among the last was Chæremon, Bishop of Nilopolis, with his wife. Some, who were overtaken by the soldiers sent in pursuit, bribed the officer to liberate them. Ischyryon, who was the deputy of a magistrate, was commanded by him to sacrifice to idols. He refused; and after suffering, in the first instance, reproaches, in the next, ill-treatment, was thrust through by his master with a stake.

Dionysius, after giving Fabius the above account, refers to those who had fallen away in time of persecution. "Those god-like Martyrs," he says, "now the assessors of CHRIST, and the partners of His Kingdom, the sharers of His Judgment, and to be fellow-judges with Him, while they were on earth, received some of their brethren who had lapsed and were guilty of having sacrificed to idols, and beholding their conversion and penitence, and believing that it was acceptable to Him, Who willeth rather the repentance than the death of a sinner, admitted them to their communion. What then, my brethren, do ye advise with respect to such? What are we to do? Shall we shew ourselves to be of the same opinion with the Martyrs, and uphold a matter decided, or rather a grace conferred by them, and have mercy on those that were pitied by them; or shall we render their decision null and void, and make ourselves judges of their sentence, and grieve their kindness, and overthrow appointed order, and offend God?" We shall presently see the importance of the inquiry.

In the meantime, Alexandria was not deserted. The Priests

Maximus, Dioscorus, Demetrius, and Lucius, are mentioned by Dionysius¹ as having been particularly active in the city; Faustinus and Aquila in the country. Of the Deacons, Faustus, Chæremón, and more especially Eusebius, signalled and endangered themselves by their zeal in visiting the prisoners, and in burying the dead.

It was while he was in the desert of Libya that Dionysius addressed his exhortation on Martyrdom to Origen, who was now imprisoned, had already suffered on the rack, and was threatened with death by fire. Of this work, considerable fragments remain.² It commences by a statement³ of the brevity of all earthly sufferings; it proceeds to set forth that God, to Whom⁴ only all wisdom belongs, appoints the measure and the term of our afflictions; that though His ways are above our thoughts, yet, with Job, we⁵ shall finally acknowledge them to have been just; that by trial only can we obtain an insight into the devices of Satan; that it was from want of such experience that Eve fell so irreparably; that the enduring hardness is the one way by which we become good soldiers of JESUS CHRIST;⁶ that our LORD Himself has left us an example, not of apathy to pain, but of resignation under it, not of praying that the Cup might never come, but that having come it might pass; that in His Agony we are to look for our best consolation in our own; that we are to deal with our enemies in all gentleness and meekness, even as He⁷ dealt with Judas;—and here the fragment abruptly terminates.—

S. Dionysius
writes to
Origen on
Martyrdom,

¹ In his Epistle to Domitius and Didymus.—This Epistle is considered by Eusebius (H. E. vii. 11) to refer to the Persecution under Valerian; and Baronius follows him. But Valesius contends, and Byæus, in a section devoted to the consideration of the subject, seems to have proved, that the historian is mistaken, and that it refers to the time of Decius.

² For these we are indebted to Nicetas Serronensis, who in his Collection of Commentaries by the Fathers on S. John and S. Luke, gives them under the title of Dionysius to Origen.

Now no other work, addressed to Origen, has been ascribed to Dionysius, except that on Martyrdom; and the whole of what remains is very suitable to such a treatise. Though, had we only been informed that the fragments were the composition of Dionysius, we should rather have referred them to his work on Temptations to Euphranor.

³ Cap. i. (Ed. Propagandæ.)

⁴ Cap. iii.

⁵ Cap. v.

⁶ Cap. vii.

⁷ Cap. xi.

S. Paul
retires into
the wilder-
ness.

There was one sufferer in this persecution, whom Dionysius does not mention, and of whose name, afterwards to become so illustrious, he was probably ignorant. This was S. Paul, the first hermit.¹ He was a native of the Lower Thebais, and was left an orphan at the age of fifteen. His property was considerable, and pains had been taken with his education. Finding himself at liberty to fix the place of his abode, he became an inmate in the family of a married sister, with whom he lived till the Decian persecution. To avoid its fury, he retired to a country house belonging to his brother-in-law; and there learnt that the latter intended to inform against him, for the sake of gaining his property. The young man was thus compelled to retire into the desert; and he soon acquired a love for the loneliness of his retreat. He frequently changed his dwelling, advancing by degrees into the wildest depths of the wilderness. At length he discovered a spot so well adapted for the life he proposed to lead, that he fixed on it as the final place of his abode. It was a cavern, the mouth of which was shaded by a palm; a fountain burst forth from the side of the hill, and entered the earth again at no great distance. The leaves of this tree afforded him his garments, and its dates his sustenance until a better method of subsistence was provided for him. He was twenty-two years old when he retired into the cave; and here he dwelt for ninety years.

A. D. 251.

The next transaction in which S. Dionysius was engaged affords a remarkable instance of the immense power tacitly claimed by, and unhesitatingly ceded to, the See of Alexandria in these early ages. The Chair of Rome was vacant, S. Fabian having received the Crown of Martyrdom on the 20th of January, A.D. 250. Such was the fury of the persecution that the Roman clergy, of whom there were then forty-six Priests and seven Deacons, found it impossible to proceed to another election; for Decius, says S. Cyprian, would sooner have allowed a competitor in his Throne than a Bishop in his metropolis.

Early life of
Novatian:

There was at that time in Rome a priest named Novatian, originally a Stoic philosopher, then possessed by a Demon, after that baptised in illness, and never subsequently confirmed: he had been raised to his Sacerdotal rank in double violation of the

¹ S. Hieronym. vit. S. Paul. § 4.

Canons ; for clinic Baptism and the not having received “the Lord’s Seal” were each a bar against Holy Orders. He, however, entertained the idea of raising himself to the highest station in the Church ; and was confirmed in his design by the arrival of Novatus, a man of bad character, a Bishop¹ or Priest of Africa, who was compelled, by the fear of punishment, to leave Carthage. Every effort was employed by the two adventurers to raise Novatian to the vacant Chair, but in vain ; for in the month of June, A.D. 251, Cornelius was, by the unanimous consent of clergy and people, elected Bishop of Rome.

he aspires to
the Chair of
Rome :

The confederates, aware that they had every thing to fear from the resolute character of the new Pontiff, determined to use their utmost endeavours to procure his deposition. Novatus had, at Carthage, charged S. Cyprian with too great harshness in re-admitting to the Communion of the Church those who had lapsed during the persecution ; but he now united with Novatian in attacking Cornelius on precisely opposite grounds. Novatian attracted to his party several of those who had distinguished themselves as confessors during the Decian persecution ; and to invest his cause with the fairer colours, he denied on oath that he had any intention of aspiring to that Bishopric which ought, he contended, from the crimes of its present occupier, to be declared vacant.

raises a party
against
S. Cornelius :

is joined by
some of the
Confessors,

The dispute became serious ; and Dionysius, who had, as he afterwards gave proof, deeply considered the subject of the reconciliation of apostates, thought fit to interfere. He addressed two letters² on the point in question ; one to the

to whom
S. Dionysius
writes :

¹ Baronius believes Novatus to have been a Bishop, because S. Cyprian says, (Ep. xlix. Ed. Pamel.) *qui Felicissimum satellitem suum diaconum—constituit.* (254, lix.) And certainly the plain sense of these words implies that he was possessed of Episcopal authority. But Pagius, (250, xv.) followed by the greater part of modern Ecclesiastical historians, assumes him to have been a Priest, because he did not assist in the consecration of his friend Novatian. They explain the passage in S. Cyprian as meaning that Novatus procured the ordination of Felicissimus. But it were surely equally easy to explain the

non-appearance of Novatus as one of the consecrators of Novatian by supposing him unwilling to put himself forward on the occasion, from a belief that the ends of his schism would be best secured by his keeping in the back ground ; or by referring to the inquiry that might thereby have been occasioned as to the crimes that had driven him from Carthage.

² Euseb. H. E. vi. 46, ad fin.—Byæus, by a comparison of the account given of these letters with the Epistles of S. Cyprian, which we have, seems satisfactorily to have shewn that they were written before the consecration of Novatian.

faithful at Rome in general, dwelling on the virtue of penitence, as effecting a re-admission into the Church even for apostates, and exhorting all parties concerned to peace and brotherly love ;—the other more particularly to the Confessors. These letters appear to have been written towards the beginning of August.

In order to have a firmer ground on which to act, Novatian sent some of his disciples to three country Bishops, in a corner of Italy, informing them that urgent business required their presence in Rome. When they were come, he invited them to a banquet, where he made them eat and drink to excess ; and while in this condition, at the uncanonical hour of four in the afternoon, they laid their hands on him, and consecrated him Bishop. One of these unhappy men afterwards confessed his fault, and was received by S. Cornelius to lay-communion ; the two others remained impenitent ; but all three were deposed.

his tenets.

The principal tenet of Novatian was the following : that those who had once fallen in time of persecution, could never be received into communion, whatever penance they might perform ; that the Church had no power of forgiving such, and could only leave them to the infinite mercy of God. The judgment of the Catholic Church has ever been more favourable.

Rules as to
the recep-
tion of the
lapsed in
Rome,

At this time, there was no general rule by which the reception of the lapsed was regulated. In the vacancy of the See, the Roman clergy, meeting in council, had decreed that those who, after expressing their penitence, were seized with mortal illness, should be allowed to receive the Holy Eucharist. For other cases, they decided nothing. S. Cyprian followed in the same course. That of S. Dionysius was milder. “ I had given directions,” he writes to Fabius, “ that communion should be allowed to the dying, if they desired it, more especially if, previously to their last illness, they had requested it.” Whereas, according to the Roman and Carthaginian rule, if the dying man had during health exhibited no signs of repentance, he was to be debarred from receiving the Viaticum. The rule of S. Gregory Nyssen, a hundred and forty years later, may be taken as a specimen of a penitential more than ordinarily strict. For voluntary apostacy, the guilty person was to continue for

Carthage,

Alexandria.

the whole course of his life among the penitents ; but even such an one was to receive the Viaticum on his death-bed ; and S. Basil adds, in his penitential canons, that the communion should be given with confidence in the compassion of God. But for apostacy occasioned by the fear of death, or the infliction of torments, S. Gregory appoints only nine years' penance ; and it was this species of denial of the Faith to which the schism of Novatian principally referred. The followers of this schismatic took the name of Cathari or Puritans.

Novatian, immediately after his consecration, wrote letters, as the custom was, to the principal Churches, giving them notice of his election, and pretending to have been ordained in spite of his opposition. These epistles created, in many places, great confusion. The cause of Novatian, at first sight, appeared fair, as shewing zeal for the preservation of the Church's purity ; and the names of those who had signed the letters carried great weight with them ; since many were known to have been Confessors at Rome for the Faith, and men, therefore, not to be suspected of countenancing schism.

Novatian
writes to
the Great
Sees :

Cornelius, for his part, was not idle. But the missives of the two rivals were attended with different effects in the two great Eastern Sees. Fabius, then Bishop of Antioch, was inclined to the party of Novatian ; Dionysius, on the contrary, replied to the letter of the schismatic in the following terms :

“Dionysius¹ to his brother Novatian, greeting.

he is
answered by
S. Dionysius.

“If you have been compelled, against your will, [to assume the Episcopate] you will prove the truth of your account by retiring from it spontaneously. It were better to suffer all things, of what kind soever, than to cut in sunder the Church of God. And the martyrdom suffered for the sake of avoiding a schism were not less glorious than that endured for refusing to sacrifice to idols. Nay, in my judgment, it would be more illustrious ; in the one case it is borne for the sake of the Martyr's own soul, in the other, for that of the whole Church.

¹ Euseb. H. E. vi. 45.—Eusebius, who confuses Novatus and Novatian, (as all the Eastern writers, except S. Dionysius, appear to have done,) gives this letter to the former ; and

Rufinus, by way of improving the error, adds, *Hæc eadem etiam Novatiano scripsit*,—which is manifestly absurd.

And if, even now, you can persuade or compel your brethren to return to concord, your well-doing will be greater than your fault. The latter will not be laid to your charge: the former will be spoken of to your honour. If you have no influence over them, and they refuse to obey, save at least your own soul. I pray that you may hold fast the peace that is in the Lord, and so bid you farewell."

This letter, which was highly celebrated at the time,¹ and for many years afterwards, produced no effect on the arch-schismatic; for he continued in his separation till his death. His schism had already begun to assume the character of a heresy, by his denial of the Power of the Keys in the case of apostacy; and he afterwards rendered it still more heterodox by extending that denial to the crimes of murder and fornication, and by condemning second marriages.

The Confessors return.

Council of Rome:
A.D. 251.

The letter of Dionysius to Novatian was written, it would seem, towards the end of August; and, in that or the ensuing month, he received an Epistle from the Roman Confessors, bewailing their error, and mentioning their return to the Church. The Council of Carthage, under S. Cyprian, had already decreed that Apostates were to be received on performing penance; though, if in Holy Orders, merely to lay-communion: its Canons were confirmed by Cornelius and sixty Bishops in the Council of Rome, where Novatian, persisting in his error, was condemned. He, for his part, dispatched Novatus into Africa, to sustain his falling party; and the absence of this man, the originator of the schism, combined with the letters of S. Dionysius and S. Cyprian, and probably the treatise of the latter on the Unity of the Church, occasioned the return of the Confessors. The Bishop of Alexandria, in the September of the same year, addressed two letters of congratulation to them on the subject.

It is plain that the Church of Rome had been in great danger of suffering a long schism. The personal authority of S. Cornelius was not sufficient to carry him through the trouble by which he was surrounded: the influence of the Confessors who

¹ S. Jerome, for instance, quotes it, in his work on illustrious men. It may be observed that the Saint studiously abstains from giving Novatian the title of Bishop; though we find it added in the translation of S. Jerome.

were leagued against him was great ; the terrors of the persecution depressed the Faithful externally as much as their own internal dissensions weakened them, and had it not been for the exertions and weight of character of Dionysius and Cyprian, the consequences to the Church might have been most pernicious.

But, though Italy was now quiet, Novatianism was in danger of pervading the East. We have already mentioned that Fabius was favourably disposed to it ; and to him Dionysius addressed the letter on the Decian persecution, to which we are indebted for our knowledge of its effects in Egypt, and subjoined the history of Serapion,¹ as a manifest proof that God approved of the administration of the Holy Communion to dying penitents, even though they had been guilty of the crime of apostacy. He also addressed his own Diocese on the same subject ; and divided the penitents into different ranks, according to their various degrees of guilt. To Conon, Bishop of Hermopolis² Magna, he sent a letter on the same subject ; his solicitude extended itself even as far as Armenia, and he wrote to Meruzanes,³ Metropolitan of Sebaste, who appears to have been inclined to Novatian errors ; as also to Thelymidres,⁴ then Bishop of Laodicea. The heresy appearing to make some

Spread of
the schism
in the East :

S. Dionysius
opposes it :

¹ Serapion was an inhabitant of Alexandria, who had passed a long life in the practice of piety. In the persecution he was overcome by torments, and denied the faith. When the storm had passed, he was received to penitence, though refused Communion. He fell ill, and remained three days without the power of speech ; on the fourth, recovering for a few moments the use of his voice, he requested to receive the Eucharist, and relapsed. The boy who waited on him ran to the Priest. It was night, and the Priest, through illness, was unable to come. Breaking off a fragment of the consecrated Bread, he gave it to the messenger, with directions, after soaking it, to place it in the mouth of Serapion. The old man was awaiting the return of the boy ; and as soon as he heard

his step, he cried out that he knew the Priest was unable to come : “ but act,” he continued, “ as he gave directions, and set me free.” The child did as he had been commanded, and Serapion gave up the ghost. S. Dionysius infers from this event, that Providence had evidently retained the old man in life, till he could receive the Eucharist ; and thereby testified approbation of the conduct of those who allowed the Communion to apostates on their death-beds.

² Eusebius only says Hermopolis ; but from Severus, who was, as we shall often have occasion to observe, Jacobite Bishop of the same See, we learn that Conon was Bishop of Aschumin, *i. e.*, Hermopolis Magna, Renaudot, p. 36.

³ See Le Quien i. 419.

⁴ Le Quien ii. 791.

progress at Alexandria, Dionysius addressed to his own flock a most elaborate letter,¹ which appears to have been successful in preventing the perversion of the faithful.

Antioch
favourable
to it:

Fabius, however, was not convinced by the epistle which he had received from Dionysius; nor yet by four or five written to him by S. Cornelius of Rome. And the persecution lulling for a short time on the death of Decius, and succession of Gallus, he took the opportunity of convoking a Council at Antioch to consider and to decide the question. To this Dionysius was summoned by several Prelates, among whom were the celebrated Firmilian, and Theoctistus of Cæsarea, whom it is pleasant thus to find in friendly communication with the See of Alexandria. But the same messenger that brought the summons, brought also the tidings of the decease of Fabius, and the accession of Demetrian. On the eve of going to Antioch, Dionysius informed Cornelius² of these events; and, together with this letter,³ he dispatched one of brotherly communion to the Church of Rome.

S. Dionysius
goes thither.

Council of
Antioch:
A.D. 252.

The Council was held under the presidency, it seems, of the new Bishop of Antioch⁴; and after the reading of the letter in

¹ Ἐπιστρεπτική.—Euseb. H. E. vi. 46.—The earlier commentators translate it *hortatory*; and so Fleury ii. 260, *une exhortation* à son troupeau d'Alexandrie. Valesius interprets it, *objurgatory*. We follow Heinichen, (in Euseb. H. E. iv. 28,) Danz. (de Euseb. p. 100) and Suicer, (i. 1194) in taking it to mean *laboured*; and so S. Cyril (in Hos. cap. 11) uses ἐπιστρέφεια.

² Euseb. H. E. vi. 46.

³ διακονική.—The sense is not certain. Goar, in his notes on George Syncellus, takes it to have been an epistle of the same kind as those called *synodica*, *dimissoria*, and the like. Valesius and Stroth make it to refer to things connected with the Diaconate; and Danz applies it to Nicostratus the Roman Deacon or Confessor, and one of the obstinate followers of Novatus.

⁴ Byæus (October Bolland. ii. 34.) here seems to make a difficulty where

there is none. Boschius the Bollandist (Julius iv. Dissert. de Pat. Antioch. § 86) thinks that Demetrian merely held the Council summoned by his predecessor. Byæus tries to prove that that Council was never held at all, and that the real Council was not held till A.D. 256. In the letter of S. Dionysius to S. Stephen of Rome, (Euseb. H. E. vii. 5) he speaks of the East as then at peace from the schism of Novatian. Now this letter was written in A.D. 256 at the earliest; therefore, according to Byæus, it follows that the Council could not have met long before. But this is by no means a necessary consequence. If Œcumenical Councils have been so long resisted before they were received and acknowledged, much rather might a provincial Synod, like that of Antioch, fail in at once effecting that order which it subsequently established.

which Pope Cornelius explained the history of Novatian, and the Acts of the Council of Rome, the schismatic was condemned as favouring sin, by rendering repentance unavailing.

It must have been either during his absence from, or immediately after his return to, Egypt, that Dionysius heard of the decease of Origen, who, worn out with years and labours, was called, as it is not unreasonable to hope, to receive the forgiveness of his errors, and the reward of his sufferings. Death of Origen. The Church of Alexandria, as it is plain from the treatise addressed to him by her Bishop, had long ceased to regard him as excommunicate.

SECTION VI.

THE MILLENARIAN CONTROVERSY.

THAT, on his return from Antioch, Dionysius visited Alexandria, it seems natural to conclude; though we have no certain evidence of the fact. It was at the same time that the great pestilence, which lasted, with intermissions, fifteen years, and of which we shall have further occasion to speak, spread from Ethiopia into Egypt, and thence over a large portion of the Roman Empire. Plague at Alexandria : A.D. 252.

It does not appear that the persecution of Gallus extended into Egypt; and the afflicted Church of Alexandria had time to breathe. Dionysius, in visiting his Diocese, had arrived at Arsinoe,¹ when he found that city and the surrounding villages under the influence of an opinion which threatened, if not checked in time, to degenerate into heresy. A belief had existed, from the earliest ages of the Church, and had numbered among its adherents Cerinthus and Papias, that, after the General Resurrection, CHRIST would personally reign on earth; that for the space of a thousand years His Saints, under that dominion, would enjoy all corporal, as well as spiritual

S. Dionysius visits his Diocese : A.D. 254.*

finds Arsinoë infected with Millenarian errors ;

¹ See Tillemont, M. E. iv. 85.

² Euseb. H. E. vii. 24, 25.

* This date cannot be fixed with

absolute certainty. See S. Dionysius, Ed. Propagandâ, p. 312: and Lumper, Historia Theol.-Crit. xiii. 67.

originally
taught there
by Nepos ;

delights ;—and that in this sense the predictions and descriptions of the Apocalypse were to be understood. Nepos, a Bishop of Arsinoë,¹ had adopted these tenets ; and as his character both for learning and holiness stood justly high, his teaching was received with avidity, and a party speedily formed itself in his favour. The Millenarians, or Chiliasts, however, were not unopposed ; and to support his views, Nepos composed a work which his followers regarded as an impregnable bulwark of his doctrine. As his opponents insisted that the Apocalypse, in those portions which he brought forward, was to be understood in a typical sense only, he entitled his treatise, *A Confutation of Allegorists*. The arguments were ingenious, the language persuasive ; and it is not wonderful that the essay should have been considered unanswerable.

and then
defended by
Coracion :

Nepos, however, had before the period of which we write been taken from the world, leaving behind him the reputation of a faithful, laborious, and learned prelate ; and endeared to his flock by the many hymns that he had composed for their use.² After his death, those who held his sentiments began to separate themselves from the communion of others ; and, led on by one Coracion, to denounce the rest of the faithful as heterodox.

he proposes
a confer-
ence :

S. Dionysius, whose account of the transaction is preserved to us by Eusebius, on his arrival at Arsinoë, called together the Priests and Deacons of that city and of the neighbouring villages, and, in general, such of the faithful as chose to attend, and proposed that the matter should be quietly and candidly discussed, and the treatise of Nepos more particularly examined. For Nepos himself he professed to entertain the highest respect ; both for his piety and his talents, and, more especially, he added, since he had already fallen asleep. It was unanimously agreed that his advice should be followed ; and for three days continuously, from morning till evening, the good Patriarch sat in the midst of the

¹ At least this appears, as Le Quien (ii. 581, 2) observes, most probable ; though the name of the See of Nepos is nowhere given.

² This is undoubtedly the meaning of Τῆς πολλῆς ψαλμωδίας :—as Stroth

turns it: *um der vielen von ihm gedichteten lieder* ; not as Valesius, *ob Psalmorum multiplices cantus*, because S. Dionysius proceeds, “ with which even now many of the brethren are delighted.”

Priests, reading and commenting on the work of the deceased Prelate, receiving and replying to objections, giving to all arguments their due consideration, and modifying his own opinions, or confessing himself to be wrong, if his opponents seemed to have truth, in any matter, on their side. He relates that he admired the moderation, intelligence, and docility of his auditors ; their unfeigned anxiety to attain the truth, and the order and propriety which they observed during the whole discussion. At the end of the three days, Coracion declared himself convinced ; and promised that he never more by writing or word of mouth would uphold the doctrine of Nepos. Thus, by the truly evangelical conduct of this great Prelate, the schism was nipped in the bud.

the question
is calmly
discussed :

the Mille-
narians own
their error :

The Patriarch, however, thought fit to confute it in writing, as he had already done in conversation ; the rather, that the Treatise against Allegorists had been dispersed through many parts of Egypt. This gave rise to his Treatise on the Promises, in which he relates the circumstances that we have just recounted.

he writes his
work on
Promises :

In treating of the Apocalypse, as the only portion of Scripture on which Nepos had founded his hypothesis, the writer's singular reverence and modesty may well account for the equally rare and happy result of the Arsinoïtan Conference. He was evidently inclined to believe the authority of the Book of Revelation doubtful. "But," says he, "I should not venture to reject it, when so many of our brethren highly esteem it. I believe that it is above the capacity of my intellect, and consider that it contains a certain hidden and marvellous explanation of all things that it sets forth. For though I understand it not, yet I suspect that there lies in it a sense deeper than words ; I measure it not, and judge it not, by my own reason ; but allowing faith more room, am of opinion that its contents are too lofty for my comprehension. I condemn not that which I cannot understand ; I rather admire it the more, because I cannot fathom it."

allows the
inspiration
of the
Apocalypse ;

He then enters into an examination of the book, which we no longer possess ; and having shewn that it cannot possibly be understood in the literal sense, he proceeds to argue, that though composed by an inspired writer, it had not S. John the Evan-

but denies
that it was
written by
S. John.

gelist for its author. His principal proof is drawn from the fact that, while the Evangelist shrinks, in his Gospel, from naming himself, and in his three epistles designates himself only from his character, or not at all, the writer of the Apocalypse seems to bring his name forward, on every occasion where the subject allows him to do so.¹ "He sent and signified it by His Angel to His servant John";—"John² to the seven Churches which are in Asia";—"I John, who am your brother and companion in labour"³; "I John saw these things and heard them."⁴ From the various phrases employed, in the Gospel and the Apocalypse, and their different degrees of grammatical correctness, he arrives at the same conclusion.

Nepos never
condemned
in a Provin-
cial Council.

There appears no reason to believe, that Dionysius found it necessary to summon a Council on the subject of Millenarian errors;—and that a Provincial Synod⁵ condemned and deposed Nepos, after his death, which has been asserted by some writers, is evidently a fable.

We now enter on the consideration of a more important controversy; and shall find the conduct of S. Dionysius marked, during its course, with the same moderation and love of peace that had distinguished him at Arsinoë.

SECTION VII.

QUESTION OF RE-BAPTISM.

It will be proper, though by so doing we a little deviate from the strict order of time, to give a concise and uninterrupted view of the unhappy division that arose on the question of reiterated Baptism:—and of the share that Dionysius took in its discussion.

The
re-baptism
of heretics
ordered by
Agrippinus
and the
Council of
Carthage,
circ. A.D.
200 :

Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, had in a synod of African Bishops decreed, in violation of Apostolic tradition, that Baptism could not be validly conferred by those who were out of

¹ Apocal. i. 2.

² Apocal. i. 4.

³ Apocal. i. 9.

⁴ Apocal. xxii. 8.

⁵ Labbé, Conc. i. 832.

the pale of the Catholic Church; that heretical Baptism was, consequently, null and void;—and that such as had received none other should, on entering the Church, be re-baptized. More than fifty years afterwards, this question was again mooted in Africa; and eighteen Bishops of Numidia, uncertain as to their proper duty, consulted S. Cyprian, who then occupied the Chair of Carthage. That Father happened at the time when their letter arrived, to be holding a Council, which was attended by thirty-one Prelates; and they, in a synodical epistle, replied to the inquiry of their brethren. The tradition of the African Church, they said, was to be observed; the Council of Agrippinus had decided the matter. S. Cyprian replied in a similar strain to the same question, after the dissolution of the Council; but without entirely satisfying the doubts that had arisen in his province.

by S. Cyprian
in a first,
(A.D. 255;)

He therefore judged it expedient to summon another and more numerous Synod of the Bishops of Africa and Numidia; and seventy-one Prelates assembled at Carthage in the early part of A.D. 256. The decrees of the former Council were confirmed in this; and a synodical epistle was addressed to S. Stephen of Rome, informing him of the decision of the African Church, and requesting his confirmation of their Acts. Stephen, though afterwards a glorious Martyr, was evidently a man of hasty temper; and he replied by an angry letter, in which, not content with exposing the fault of receding from an Apostolic tradition, he threatened the African Bishops with excommunication, if they persisted in their sentiments.

second,
(A.D. 256,*
before
Easter;)

S. Cyprian, undaunted by the reception of this epistle, convoked a third Council on the same subject; and used his utmost endeavours that it should be as numerous as was possible. Eighty-five Bishops were present; and the decision of Agrippinus was a third time confirmed as well by their own subscriptions, as by that of two absent brethren, whose proxies were given to the Synod. The Acts of this Council were dispatched to Rome under the care of some of the Fathers. But Stephen refused to see the messengers; he forbade the faithful of Italy to shew them any hospitality; and com-

and third
Council,
September 1,
A.D. 256.

Rupture
with Pope
S. Stephen.

* See Pearson, Annal. Cypr. for the verification of this date.

manded them to return without loss of time to Africa, and to inform their brethren that, unless they acknowledged their error, he should proceed to the threatened excommunication.

S. Cyprian
applies to
S. Firmilian.

S. Cyprian, finding that the African Church was unable to carry its point, looked round him for assistance. He knew that his opinion was prevalent in the East; that the Councils of Iconium and Synnada, holden in or about the year 230, had ordered iteration of Baptism; and that some of the most eminent among the Oriental Prelates, as S. Firmilian¹ of Cæsarea, and Helenus of Tarsus, had incurred the displeasure of Stephen by their adherence to the decrees of those Synods. To Firmilian, then, Cyprian wrote; consulting him on the steps which it might be proper to pursue under the present emergency, when their common cause was in danger, and when the See of Rome appeared to be stretching its prerogatives too far.

S. Stephen
consults
S. Dionysius:

his reply,

It has been conjectured² that, in this letter, which no longer exists, S. Cyprian had requested Firmilian to interest Dionysius in the matter. With Firmilian, the Bishop of Alexandria must have been personally acquainted; for they had met in the Council of Antioch; of Cyprian, he seems to have had no more intimate knowledge than that necessarily arising from the high station and well known character of each Prelate. It would seem, however, that Stephen himself was the first to bring the subject before Dionysius. The latter, in his reply, earnestly requested the Pope to proceed with moderation, and not to disturb the peace of the Church, then, as he relates at length, but just recovering from the Novatian schism,³ by any harsh decision with

¹ Our reason for reckoning this illustrious Prelate among the Blessed may be seen in the Preface.

² By Boschius the Bollandist in his previous Commentary to the Life of S. Stephen, under August 1. Byæus (October ii. 37) has proved this hypothesis, chronologically, to be almost impossible, however ingenious at first sight.

³ Quoted by Eusebius, H. E. vii. 5. The arrangement of the letters of S. Dionysius will be this:—1. To Pope S. Stephen quoted as above,—

2. To Philemon.—3. To S. Dionysius of Rome, then a Priest. Of these no fragments remain: but they are mentioned in the next following.—4. The first to S. Sixtus, quoted by Eusebius, H. E. vii. 5, 6.—5. The second to Philemon, quoted by Eusebius, H. E. vii. 7.—6. The second to S. Dionysius, quoted by Eusebius, H. E. vii. 8.—7. The second to S. Sixtus, quoted by Eusebius, H. E. vii. 9.—8. The third to S. Sixtus, not quoted, but referred to in the same § of the same chapter. Of these, Eusebius does not reckon

respect to the African and Oriental Prelates. At the same time he wrote to Dionysius and Philemon, who had consulted him on the same subject; they were then Priests of the Church of Rome; and the former afterwards attained to the Chair of S. Peter.

S. Cyprian and S. Stephen, though they could not agree on a matter of minor importance, were united by a glorious and nearly contemporary Martyrdom in the persecution of Valerian. To S. Sixtus, the successor of Stephen, Dionysius again wrote; letter to Pope S. Sixtus, and a second time urged the necessity of union and mutual forbearance. To Philemon and Dionysius he also addressed to Philemon and S. Dionysius of Rome: two other letters; and in the former, speaking of the subject in question, he affirms (what none can doubt), that the tradition which he had from ‘the blessed Pope Heraclas’ was to require renunciation of error, and profession of Faith, but not to re-baptize those, who having been baptized in the Church, had been seduced to heresy, and had then rejoined themselves to Catholic Communion. And in a second letter to S. Sixtus, he relates the following tale:

“One of the brethren, who gather together in the church, his second letter to Pope S. Sixtus: and who had long been accounted a member of the congregation before my ordination, or even, as I think, that of the blessed Heraclas, happened to be present at a Baptism. When he had heard the questions which were put to, and the answers received from, the candidates, he came to me weeping and bemoaning himself; and falling at my feet, he confessed and abjured the Baptism which he had received among the heretics, as not being of the same kind, nor having any the remotest resemblance to it; rather, he affirmed, it was full of impiety and blasphemy. His soul, he said, was filled with the most bitter remorse; nor did he dare to lift up his eyes to God, since the commencement of his Christian life had been those unholy words and actions. He therefore besought me to bestow on him that most pure laver and adoption and grace.

the 2nd and 3rd in his enumeration, perhaps because they were short. *Πρότερον μὲν ὀλίγα*, says Dionysius, speaking of them, *ἐπέστειλα*. So that he reckons the 4, 5, 6, 7th, as the

2, 3, 4, 5th. The first three of these must have been written in A.D. 256; the last five between August, A.D. 257, and August A.D. 258. See Byæus c. x.

This I dared not to do : saying that his long continued communion was sufficient. I bade him be of good courage, and approach with an untroubled conscience to the participation of the Holy Mysteries. He, however, continues to mourn ; he shudders to approach the Table, and hardly, though exhorted, dares to assist at the prayers.” On these circumstances he requests the Pope’s advice. Eusebius informs us that he addressed the Church of Rome again on the subject of heretical Baptism, in the name of the Church of Alexandria ; and considered the question at great length.

S. Dionysius’s own opinion,

A doubt has been raised as to the opinion which Dionysius himself entertained on the validity of heretical baptism : a question, which but for the extremely confused account given by Eusebius, after his accustomed manner, of the whole correspondence, could hardly have been agitated.

though misstated by S. Jerome,

It appears clear that the views of S. Dionysius were opposed to those of the re-baptizers ; but that he was for allowing each Church to act according to its own traditions. S. Jerome indeed says,¹ that he consented to the dogma of S. Cyprian and the African Synod, and wrote many letters on the re-baptism of heretics, which were then extant. But, in the first place, it is very doubtful if that Father were in possession of more of his epistles than the fragments preserved to us by Eusebius ; and, in the second, if he were, as we cannot suppose Dionysius to have contradicted himself, the lost letters must have contained the same doctrine with those which we now possess.²

and rendered obscure by the confused account of Eusebius,

Now, of the five Epistles of which we have fragments remaining, the first, addressed to S. Stephen, contains nothing which can be alleged either for or against our assertion. The same may be said of the fourth, which is written to S. Dionysius of Rome. But in the second (which is the first to Pope Sixtus) he says, “ Consider the importance of the subject. It has been decreed, as I am informed, in very large Synods of Bishops, that they who come over from heresy should first be instructed³

¹ Catalog. Illust. Vir. 69.

² And yet Fleury (ii. 305) unhesitatingly follows S. Jerome, “ Saint Denis évêque d’Alexandrie étoit dans les mêmes sentiments que S. Cyprien.”

³ Προκατηχηθέντας.—See Coutant’s remarks on the note of Valesius, Ed. Prop. S. Dion. 154.

in the True Faith, and then be washed and purged from the filth of their impure leaven." And again, in the third Epistle, which is to Philemon:—"I have learnt this also,—that this custom was not now introduced for the first time, nor in the African Church alone; but long before this, under Bishops who have preceded us, and in very populous Churches; and that it approved itself to the Synods holden at Iconium and Synnada, and to many of the brethren. Whose decisions if you overthrow, I cannot bear that they should be thrown into strife and contention. For it is written, 'Thou shalt not remove the landmarks of thy neighbour, which thy fathers have set'."

These fragments, if they at first sight seem to countenance S. Jerome's assertion, appear, on a little closer consideration, to be nothing more than a deprecation of too harsh a mode of vindicating what Dionysius allowed to be the true doctrine. True, he seems to say to the Roman Pontiff and his Presbyter, you have right on your side; but recollect by how many Bishops, and for how long a time, the opposite notion has been received, and do not plunge the Church into confusion by excommunicating the re-baptizers as if guilty of heresy.

The story which we have above quoted from the second letter of Dionysius to S. Sixtus leads us to the same conclusion. That Prelate certainly doubted whether the baptism were valid that had been received by the aged man of whom he speaks; but clearly he doubted this, not because it was conferred by heretical hands, but because it was conferred in an heretical way. This baptism, we are expressly told, was in no respect similar to that of the Catholics. If then, even in such an extreme case, Dionysius doubted of the propriety of re-baptism, a case in which every Council that treated the subject commanded reiteration, how strongly must he have been opposed to a second Baptism, when the rite had been administered, though by heretics, in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST!

It is objected that S. Dionysius himself assigns another reason for refusing in this case, to re-baptize,—namely, that the aged man who applied to him had made good his want of baptism, by his long enjoyment of the Communion of the Church. This, however, seems rather an argument addressed

and objections drawn from it,

was opposed to that of the Africans,

to the inquirer himself, than a reason brought forward for the consideration of the Pope. Be it so, he seems to say: consider, if you will, your heretical Baptism invalid. But be of good cheer, nevertheless; it has been supplied to you by your frequent participation in the Divine Mysteries. To conclude: in the case before us, is there any doubt that S. Cyprian would have re-baptized the individual without further hesitation?

as S. Basil
distinctly
states.

One thing more we learn from this account. It appears clear from it that, as early as the time of Demetrius, the practice of the Alexandrian Church was opposed to the iteration of Baptism, or the layman of whom Dionysius writes would not, in the first instance, have been received without it. And whatever authority the testimony of S. Jerome may be supposed to have, it cannot possess more weight than that of S. Basil,¹ who expressly affirms that Dionysius allowed the validity of heretical Baptism, and adds his astonishment that so great a master of canonical learning should not even have rejected that of the Pepuzenes; although, says he, they baptized into the FATHER, and the SON, and Montanus and Priscilla. By this he simply intends to say that by the HOLY GHOST they meant the Spirit that had animated Montanus and Priscilla, and of whom, indeed, Montanus professed to be an incarnation.

End of the
controversy.

The controversy, for the time, remained undecided; or rather, the increasing fury of the persecution of Valerian removed the principal disputants to that Place where there are no more controversies. It was decided by the Council of Nicæa²; and before that period, iteration of Baptism was virtually abandoned by all, except a few of the Numidian Prelates. The interference of S. Dionysius seems not to have been without its effect; and to it we may ascribe the abstinence of Stephen from excommunicating S. Firmilian and the African Bishops.

¹ Epist. Can. ad Amphiloch. § 5.—
And see Coutant's note; Opp. S.
Dionys. Ed. Propagand. p. 158.

² That it was not finally condemned
till then,—and that Nicæa was the
“Plenary Council” of which S. Augus-

tine so often speaks,—seems to be
generally conceded to the arguments
of Bellarmin and Natalis Alexander;
through others, as Launoy and Sir-
mond, understand the expression of
the Great Council of Arles, A.D. 314.

SECTION VIII.

THE controversy on Baptism was yet at its height, when an unexpected calamity overwhelmed the Church. Valerian, who had hitherto favoured Christianity in a remarkable degree, insomuch, says Dionysius,¹ that not even those who were openly said to be Christians, (that is, Philip and Alexander Severus,) proved themselves warmer friends to its professors, now altered his conduct and commenced that persecution which is usually reckoned as the Ninth. To this change he was incited by Macrianus, a man whose wealth, experience, and military talents, gave him influence second only to that of the emperor. He had been informed by an Egyptian astrologer, that he should one day succeed to the Imperial Throne :—and he, in consequence, took on himself the patronage of the whole tribe of soothsayers and prognosticators. As the Church ceased not to proclaim the abandoned character of these men, and the unlawful nature of their art, Macrianus determined to revenge himself on those that had insulted and injured his favourites.

A.D. 257.
Valerian,
incited by
Macrianus,

persecutes
the Church,

As soon as the edict of persecution reached Alexandria, Dionysius was summoned before Æmilian, Augustal Prefect. He was not left to face his trial alone.² Maximus, then one of his priests, afterwards his successor, accompanied him to the tribunal : so also did three deacons : and a Christian from Rome, named Marcellus, who happened to be at Alexandria, went with the Patriarch to the Augustal. Of the good confession that these servants of CHRIST then witnessed, we have an account from the pen of Dionysius, who, however, with characteristic modesty, chooses rather to transcribe the public Acts, than to relate his answers from his own remembrance.

S. Dionysius
after con-
fessing be-
fore Æmili-
an,

“ Æmilian, the Prefect, said :—I now, by word of mouth, as heretofore by writing, set before you the clemency of our princes. They give you the power of preserving your lives, if you will

¹ Euseb. H. E. vii. 10.

² Euseb. H. E. vii. 11.

turn to that which is agreeable to nature, and adore the gods that preserve their empire, and forget that which is contrary to nature. What say you to this? I expect that you will not be unthankful with respect to their kindness, since, assuredly, they are for turning you to a better course. Dionysius answered:—All men do not adore the same divinities, but each worships those whom he considers to be gods. We reverence and adore One God, the Maker of all things, Who gave the empire into the hands of Valerian and Gallienus, beloved of God, and to Him we pray continually, that their government may remain unshaken. Æmilian, the Prefect, said to them: Who hinders your adoring Him also, if, as you say, He is God, together with those that are by nature gods? You have been commanded to worship the gods, and such gods as all own. Dionysius said: We adore none other. Æmilian, the Prefect, said to them: I see that you are at once ungrateful for, and unconscious of, the clemency of our Augusti. Wherefore you shall not remain in this city, but shall be sent into Libya, to the place called Kefro. I have chosen this spot as directed by the Augusti. But it shall in no manner be lawful for you, nor for any else, to hold assemblies, nor to enter into the so called cemeteries. If any one shall be convicted of not going to the place which I have mentioned, or shall be found in any assembly, he shall bring danger on his own head, and the fitting animadversion shall not be wanting. Depart then whither you have been commanded.”

is banished
to Kefro,

Kefro, or, as the Arabians call it, Valorri,³ lay in the wilds of Libya; and thither Dionysius, though labouring under illness, was at once hurried. A large body of Christians accompanied him thither; some from Alexandria, others from various other parts of Egypt. The Gospel had not hitherto been preached in this place; and there, to use the Patriarch's own words, the Lord opened a great door for the Word. For though the little band of believers were reviled and exposed to personal violence, before long a large number of the heathen left the worship of idols, and gave their names to CHRIST. God had evidently led His servants to that place, to be the founders of a flourishing Church; and when that ministry was fulfilled, he conducted them to another spot. Among the Bishop's fellow exiles, we

where he
preaches
with great
success:

¹ Severus, ap. Renaud. p. 36.

have already spoken of Maximus. The deacon Eusebius, having been sent into Syria to oppose the heresy of Paul of Samosata, was there made Bishop of Laodicea, and the deacon Faustus, in extreme old age, finished his course by martyrdom under Diocletian.¹

Æmilian, hearing of the progress that the Faith was making at Kefro, gave orders that Dionysius should be removed to Coluthion, a city of Mareotis. The Bishop confesses that he was much annoyed on receiving this intimation: the place was infested by robbers, and tenanted by a wild race. His friends, however, represented that it was nearer to Alexandria; that if at Kefro the resort of Christians had been great, the inhabitants of the metropolis would flock to Coluthion as to a suburb; that the change was evidently designed, by the Head of the Church, for its good. And so it fell out.

While Dionysius was thus enacting the part of a brave and vigilant pastor, and towards the end of the persecution, he was exposed to considerable annoyance by Germanus,² an Egyptian Bishop, though it is uncertain in what See. Germans accused the Patriarch of general carelessness and remissness in his pastoral duties, but more especially of neglecting, during the time of his exile, to assemble for worship the Christians who were with him. Dionysius replied by the letter, to which we are indebted for the particulars which have reached us of his behaviour, during both the persecution of Decius and that of Valerian.

At the same time, he was engaged in writing other letters, both regarding his own Church, and that of other countries. He was in correspondence with S. Sixtus on the Baptismal question: we find him also addressing the presbytery of the Alexandrian Church, during the greatest violence of the persecution. Two other letters, respectively addressed to Flavian, and to Didymus and Domitius, require a few observations.

They were Paschal letters, and, as it is supposed³ by some, the first of their kind. But whether S. Dionysius followed the example of his predecessors, or was the original author of the

¹ Euseb. H. E. vii. 11, ad fin. Le Quien, ii. 791 B.

² Euseb. H. E. ii. 1.

³ Vit. S. Dionys. in Ed. Propagand. p. ciii. We have already stated (p. 29) that some writers attribute their origin to S. Demetrius.

and com-
poses his
Paschal
Cycle of
eight years.

custom, it is certain that from this time, the Patriarchs of Alexandria annually announced the date of the commencement of Lent, and of Easter Day. Custom at first, at the Council¹ of Nicæa this became law; and many of these Paschal Epistles, especially of Theophilus, S. Cyril, and we may now add, of S. Athanasius, still remain to us. They began with a sermon on the Festival, whence they are indifferently known as Homilies or Epistles, and end with the required announcement. Those of Dionysius appear to have been addressed to various Egyptian Bishops, and not to have been possessed of, nor to have claimed, authority beyond the limits of his own Diocese. Afterwards this office, exercised with respect to the whole Church,² was a most honourable, and somewhat laborious function of the See of Alexandria.

Office of the
Patriarch of
Alexandria

Alexandria had been, from the first, so noted a school of Mathematics, that it is not wonderful to find its Prelates engaged in calculations connected with the Calendar. But we may justly admire the zeal displayed by Dionysius for the minuter points connected with the Service of God, when we find him, during the violence of the persecution, engaged in the composition of his Paschal Cycle. It contained a period of eight years.³ S. Hippolytus had already composed one of sixteen: but that of S. Dionysius was, by the Fathers of Nicæa, made the basis of a more extended cycle of nineteen³ years, which is known by the name of the Alexandrine. The octennial period was doubtless suggested to the Patriarch by the *Octaeterides* of Cleostratus, Harpalus, and Eudoxus. It was in his above-named Epistle to Domitius and Didymus that he promulgated this cycle; and laid down,⁴ at the same time, his celebrated Canon, that Easter cannot fall previously to the Vernal Equinox.

Heortastic
Epistles.

¹ Le Quien ii. 378 B.

² S. Leo, writing to Marcian, (Ep. 94) says, speaking of errors in regard to the celebration of Easter, "Studuerunt itaque Sancti Patres (sc. Nicæni) occasionem hujus erroris auferre, omnem hanc curam Alexandrino Episcopo delegantes; quoniam apud Ægyptios hujus supputationis antiquitus tradita

esse videbatur peritia," &c. And see Le Quien, ii. 377.

³ It is singular that both Tillemont (iv. 274) and Fleury should speak of this as a cycle of eighteen years; there being no ground for, nor reason in, such an arrangement.

⁴ Vit. S. Dionys. ii. 1.

⁵ Euseb. H. E. vii. 10:—where see Stroth's translation and note.

SECTION IX.

RISE OF THE SABELLIAN HERESY.

HITHERTO S. Dionysius, though often well nigh overwhelmed with affliction, and suffering alike from sickness and want, from the oppression of enemies, and the calumnies of false friends, had run a course equally glorious for himself and profitable for the Church over which he presided. He had stood forth the pacificator of the East and West ; he had crushed, in its rise, a dangerous heresy ; he had been distinguished for his zeal in ascertaining the discipline, as well as maintaining the doctrine of the Church, and he had gloriously confessed CHRIST in two several persecutions. Again he was called to defend the One Faith against a new and more perilous heresy ; and although, through the infirmity of human nature, he had nearly tarnished his former glory, and from an illustrious defender, become a powerful adversary of the Truth, the same meekness and humility that had made him willing to listen to the reasonings of the partizans of Nepos, rendered him ready to give ear to the admonitions of a Roman Council.

Rise of Sabellianism

It was at the commencement of the persecution of Valerian, or perhaps even somewhat earlier, that Sabellius began to disseminate his doctrine in Pentapolis : and denying the real distinction of Persons, to annihilate the doctrine of the Ever Blessed Trinity. The heresy was not new :—it was, in effect, the same with that which had, at an earlier period, been propagated by Praxeas ; and had been taught to Sabellius by his master, the heretic Noetus. In its earlier forms, it had made but little progress ; but now, assuming a more definite shape, and attracting to itself the elements of congenial errors, it spread rapidly through the whole of Pentapolis. If it be true that Sabellius¹ was Bishop of Ptolemais, as an uncertain tradition asserts, it had a firm basis whence to propagate itself : and falling in, as we have elsewhere

in Pentapolis:

¹ So Zonaras asserts : but his evidence is unsupported by any other writer. Byæus, Octob. Bolland. ii. 47.

its rapid
spread,

and funda-
mental
dogmas.

It is opposed:

the contend-
ing parties
appeal to S.
Dionysius,

who con-
demns the
heresy,

observed, with the mystical temperament of Egyptian minds, it had soon infected, not only a large portion of the laity, with a considerable number of Priests, but was cherished by more than one Bishop in the neighbouring Sees, in particular, by Ammonius of Bernice. The dogma thus acquiring strength may be briefly stated as follows :—That the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST are one Hypostasis ; one Person with Three Names ; that the same Person, in the old dispensation, as FATHER, gave the law ; in the new, as SON, was incarnate for the sake of man ; and as HOLY GHOST, descended upon the Apostles at the Day of Pentecost. As the natural consequence of the dissemination of this doctrine, the Son of GOD was no more preached in the churches. But some there were who were valiant for the Truth of God, and who girded up their loins to contend for the Faith. They represented, in the words of S. Dionysius,¹ that the new teaching was full of impiety and blasphemy against the Almighty GOD, the Father of Our LORD JESUS : full of unbelief against His Only begotten SON, the First-born of every creature, the WORD, That dwelt among men ; and full of madness against the HOLY GHOST.

The partizans of Sabellius daily increasing, both parties appealed to Dionysius, who was then in exile at Kefro. Not content with consulting him by letter, they despatched trustworthy persons to receive his decision by word of mouth ; and he listened with patience to the assertions and arguments of the contending factions. When they had concluded, he lost no time in making his decision, and in setting himself, by several letters, to oppose the new heretic. Of his proceedings, he gave an account to Sixtus of Rome, in the first Epistle which he addressed to the Pontiff on the subject of re-baptism, to which we have heretofore referred. He wrote to Ammonius,² who seems to have been a Prelate of talent, and one whom it was therefore important, on all accounts, to reclaim from error ; to Telesphorus, and to Euphranor,³ who were probably also Bishops in the Pentapolis, and again to Ammonius and Euphranor conjointly.

¹ Ap. Euseb. H. E. vii. 6.

² Euseb. H. E. vii. 26. We might have imagined that Ammonius, or as Eusebius calls him, Ammon, was one of the Bishops who upheld the Catholic

doctrine. But the testimony of S. Athanasius is decisive. Conf. De Sent. Dionys. § 5. with § 13.

³ Or Euporus, according to Eusebius. But the account of S. Athanasius is of far more weight.

But the last letter, instead of composing, did but excite the controversy. Since the Sabellians, confounding the FATHER and the SON, attributed to the former those things which referred to the Human Nature of the latter, in the same manner that the Patripassians had done before them; it was the object of Dionysius to demonstrate that what was attributed to the Humanity of CHRIST, could not be predicated of the FATHER.¹ and expounds the Catholic Faith: He thus intended to compel his adversaries to an admission of the distinction between the Persons of the FATHER and the SON; and this was to be considered only as the first part of his argument. He would then have demonstrated the Divinity of the Son of GOD; and having confuted those that confounded the Persons, would have guarded himself against the imputation of dividing the Substance. And this method of teaching is approved by S. Athanasius.

That Father was constantly traduced by the Arians, as if he contradicted the doctrine delivered by S. Dionysius; he devoted a treatise to the consideration and refutation of their objections: and from it we obtain a fuller insight into the merits of the Pentapollitan controversy, than the meagre and somewhat unfair account of Eusebius supplies. The method pursued by Dionysius was considered by his great successor to be consonant with that employed by the Apostles. They, he says, exhibited first the Human Actions of CHRIST to the Jews: they thus endeavoured to convince them, from His miracles, that Messiah was come, and then, and not till then, made manifest, by the consideration of His marvellous works, that this same Messiah was their LORD and their God.

But the epistle to Ammonius and Euphranor unfortunately contained only the first portion of the Patriarch's argument. Incautiously, it would appear, Dionysius suffered himself to be hurried on in his most true assertion of the SAVIOUR's real Personality and Humanity, to the failure of setting forth, according to the full analogy, His Consubstantiality and Divinity. He asserted nothing, so far as we now have the means of judging, that was contrary to Catholic Truth; but he did not sufficiently guard his assertions from the possibility of misconception and misre-

¹ S. Athanas. § 9. (i. 195. Ed. Patav. 1777). And see Byæus, Octob. ii. 48. § 147.

gives offence
to the ortho-
dox.

presentation. When he was in reality speaking of the Human Nature, his enemies might say, and weaker brethren might believe, that he was speaking of the Divine. And one famous passage gave a handle to a formal impeachment of his orthodoxy.

“The SON of GOD, he wrote, was made and produced. He is not proper in His Nature, but differing, in essence, from the FATHER, as the vine from the husbandman, and the boat from the shipwright : for seeing that He was made, He was not before He was produced.”

The
Catholics of
Pentapolis
complain to
S. Dionysius
of Rome :

who, in
Council,
condemns
the extracts
submitted to
him :

These expressions of S. Dionysius occasioned no small controversy throughout Pentapolis. Some, who were entirely opposed to the doctrine of Sabellius, saw as much danger in that of Dionysius ; and their zeal caused them to forget their charity.—Without writing to their own Patriarch,¹ without considering that he might be able to explain or willing to retract that which they deemed heretical in his statements, they laid a formal complaint before S. Dionysius of Rome, who had succeeded S. Sixtus in A.D. 259. The heads of their charge were two ;—that the Bishop of Alexandria asserted the SON of GOD to be a creature, and refused the word and the doctrine of Consubstantiality. A Council, whether already assembled for some other cause, or convoked by the Pope to decide on this, condemned without hesitation the doctrine contained in, or deduced from, the extracts submitted to them. The Bishop of Rome wrote, in their name as well as in his own², to his namesake of Alexandria, informing him both of the charges made against him, and of the decision to which the Council of Rome had come. At the same time, perhaps to vindicate himself from the suspicion of holding an opposite error, the Pontiff himself composed a work against the Sabellians.³

The Bishop of Alexandria, on the receipt of these missives, found himself put, as it were, on his trial, with Rome for his accuser, and the whole Church for his judge. That he, whose whole life had been one long struggle with heresy,—he, who could look back on the time when he confirmed in the faith or

¹ S. Athanas. de Sentent. S. Dionysii, § 13.

² S. Athanas. de Synod.

³ Baronius, (263, xxxvi.) and Na-

talis Alexander, make a singular mistake, from a mistranslation of the words of S. Athanasius, in attributing this treatise against the Sabellians to Dionysius of Alexandria.

disposed to unity the very Pontiff who now appeared as his opponent,—that he should thus be compelled to stand on his defence must have been a bitter task ; and one which a proud spirit would probably have refused, even though he had thereby plunged the whole Church into an abyss of confusion. Not so Dionysius.

He had already, it appears, addressed a letter¹ to the Bishop of Rome on the same subject ; and more particularly in defence of his unwillingness to use the word *Consubstantial*. But he now, under the title of a *Refutation and Apology*², composed four books,³ or epistles,⁴ (for they are indifferently called by both names) against the accusations of the Pentapolitans. He complains that his accusers quoted his words in so disjointed and arbitrary a manner, that they misrepresented his sense ;—that they uniformly affixed to them the worst signification, and made him say things which he was far from intending.

A.D. 261 or 262.
the Bishop of Alexandria composes his *Refutation and Apology* ;

in which he partly denies,

His adversaries had urged against him that he had asserted the *Sox* to be different in substance from the *FATHER* ; bringing forward the unhappy,—because nakedly stated,—illustration of the *Vine* and the *Vinedresser*.

He replies, that he had not used the term *Consubstantial*, as not having found it in *Scripture*⁵ ; but that his meaning, if rightly considered, was the same with that of those who employed it ; that the examples in his first letter sufficiently proved this, and that on this account he was grieved to be unable, at the moment, to lay his hands on a copy of it ;—that as a plant

partly explains the charges brought against him.

¹ This is clear from the passage of the first book of the *Refutation*, quoted by S. Athanasius, *de Sent.* § 23.

² S. Athanasius perhaps (*de Sentent.* § 14) rather stretches a point in arguing from this very title that the Arians could not claim Dionysius as their own. But see Bull, *Defens. F. N.* ii. 11, 4.

³ Modern writers generally say, three. Fleury, vii. 54, “Saint Denis—répondit—par un ouvrage divisé en trois livres.” This probably arises from the fact, that S. Athanasius, in the before quoted treatise, refers only to the first, second, and third books of the

Apology. But Eusebius (*H.E.* vii. 26) and S. Jerome (*Catalog.* 69,) expressly say that there were four : so that the non-quotation of the fourth by Athanasius is probably accidental. After all, it is just possible that Fleury is right ; and that Eusebius counted in the previous Epistle to Dionysius of Rome as one of the books of the *Apology*, because it was on the same subject.

⁴ S. Athanasius calls them so more than once : so does S. Basil (*de Spirit. Sanct.* cxxix.)

⁵ *De Sent.* 20.

differed from its root, a river from its fountain, while yet in each case, the nature of both was the same; so it was with respect to these Divine Persons.

It had been urged against him that he had asserted the SON not of necessity to be eternally existent. He answers, that what he affirmed was totally different; namely, that the FATHER only was self-existent, the SON existing in and by the FATHER¹; in the same manner as if the Sun were eternal its splendour would be co-eternal; yet not self-existent, but eternally derived from the Sun. He had always, he said, affirmed the eternity of the FATHER'S existence as FATHER; and therefore by implication affirmed the eternity of the SON. It had also been objected that he had spoken of the FATHER and SON separately, as if wishing to make a division of Their substance.² He answers, that in naming the FATHER, he implied the SON by the very title; if there were no SON, how could there be a FATHER? In like manner, in naming the SON, he implied the FATHER; if there were no FATHER, how could there be a SON? His opponents had said, that the FATHER, according to him, had created all things. He defends himself by returning that he had expressly guarded that assertion. The FATHER, he had affirmed, was not properly and by way of generation Father of the things which He created; therefore He had not created that of which He was properly and by way of generation Father; and therefore it followed from his statement, that the Word was uncreated.

Proceeding to another illustration, he says,³ that as the heart indites a good word, the thought and word yet remaining entirely distinct and unconfused, the one dwelling in the heart, the other on the lips, while yet one does not exist without the other, but the thought engenders the word, and the word exhibits the thought, and the thought is an implicit word, and the word an explicit thought, and the thought is the father of the word, and the word the child of the thought, existing with it, existing from it; even so that Great Father and Universal Mind hath before all things His Son, as His Word, Interpreter, and Angel.

¹ Ibid. 18.

² Ibid. 17.

³ Ibid. 23.

This apology was considered satisfactory;—and the Bishop of Alexandria retained his reputation as the first living Doctor of the Church.¹ Doubtless it was providentially ordered that the suspicious passages in the letter against Sabellius received so full an explanation;—otherwise that Epistle would have formed the great bulwark of the Arians in the subsequent controversy. Even as it was, they, as we have seen, abused it to their own purposes;—and there have not been wanting some, and they not unable, judges who have believed him, however innocently, to have given the first hint to the then undeveloped frenzy of Arius.²

His defence
is accepted.

¹ It is curious to read the account which the Mahometan historian, Makrizi, gives of the tenets of Sabellius.—“Others said: That the SON depends on the FATHER, as one flame of fire depends on another flame, and that the one cannot be severed from the other without thereby receiving detriment. This was the opinion of Sabellius from the Thebais, and his followers.” (§ 123, Ed. Wetzer.)

² The opinions entertained by S. Basil and Gennadius on the orthodoxy of Dionysius, will be more fitly examined in a note. The words of the latter, who flourished towards the close of the fifth century, are these: *Nihil creatum, aut serviens, in TRINITATE credamus, ut vult Dionysius, fons Ariani*. But the testimony of this author has not much weight in a subject like the present; the rather that all he knew about Dionysius he seems to have known through S. Basil. To the latter Father, therefore, we turn. In his epistle to Maximus,—the passage is too well known and too long for quotation,—he makes the three following assertions: 1. That Dionysius sowed the first seeds of the Anomœan,—the rankest off-shoot of the Arian, heresy; 2. That he is inconsistent, sometimes allowing, sometimes rejecting, the use of the word *Consubstan-*

tial; 3. That he reckons the HOLY GHOST among created things, and thus rejects His Divinity. With respect to the first assertion: it seems certain that S. Basil, at the time of writing this Epistle, had not read the defence of Dionysius by S. Athanasius; but that he had not read Dionysius’s own defence, addressed to his namesake of Rome, whatever Baronius says to the contrary (263, xliii.), is sufficiently proved by Tillemont (*Mon. Ecc. iv.* 262), and Byæus (§ 215), to be extremely improbable. All that can be said is, that Basil, at the time of writing to Maximus, was young,—it is certain that he was not yet a Bishop,—and that he wrote somewhat more hastily than his mature judgment approved. As to the second assertion of S. Basil, it is as unjust to accuse S. Dionysius of inconsistency on this point, as it would be to bring the same charge against the Church itself. The great Council of Antioch, holden A.D. 269 or 270, against Paul of Samosata, rejected (at least this seems most probable,) the term, because that heretic had abused it: the Council of Nicæa insisted on it, because Arius could be exposed by none other. Thus, in writing against Sabellius, Dionysius refused to employ it, lest he should appear to favour the sentiments of his opponent;

SECTION X.

WAR, FAMINE, AND PLAGUE IN ALEXANDRIA.

A.D. 260.

THE exile of S. Dionysius was not of very long duration. He had himself applied to Valerian the words of the Apocalypse; "there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months."¹ And in fact Valerian, after persecuting the Church for three years and a half, was taken prisoner by Sapor, King of Persia, by whom he was treated with every indignity during a ten years' captivity, and at last flayed alive. He was nominally succeeded by his son Gallienus, who had been associated with him in the purple; but the Roman Empire groaned under the violence of the Thirty Tyrants. Gallienus was anxious to put a stop to the persecution; but Macrianus, who with his sons, assumed the purple in the East, remained the same bitter enemy to Christianity that he had ever been. Alexandria owned allegiance to him²;

Valerian is
taken
prisoner:

the Thirty
Tyrants:

when accused of denying the Divinity of the SON of GOD, he expressed his willingness to adopt it. It may also be observed that, where he most strongly denied the SON'S Consubstantiality with the FATHER, he is speaking of His Human Nature. With reference to S. Basil's third assertion, it has been thought, among others by Bull, (D.F.N. ii. 11, 3,) Byæus, (§ 217,) and Tillemont, (iv. 282.) that he afterwards changed his opinion. In his first canonical epistle, he twice gives Dionysius his usual title of Great: and in his treatise on the HOLY SPIRIT, he cites a passage of his in defence of the doctrine of His Divinity. It is true that, in quoting this testimony, he calls it *wonderful*; and the Benedictine Editors thence infer that Basil never changed his opinion: but, argues Byæus, it seems fairer to interpret his meaning to be an ex-

pression of admiration at the majesty and clearness of the passage which he is citing. This might be very possibly said, if the word used by S. Basil were *θαυμάσιον*—but since it is *παράδοξον*—rather *strange* and *unexpected* than *admirable*—and above all *παράδοξον ἀκούσαι*, we cannot but think the Benedictine Editors' interpretation the more probable.

¹ Apocal. xiii. 5. Euseb. H. E. vii. 10.

² This seems the most natural way of composing the contradictory evidence of historians. We have fixed A.D. 260 as the date of Valerian's captivity. Pearson in his Ann. Cyp. and Pagi in his Critice have summed up nearly all the arguments that can be brought forward, the former for 260, the latter for 259. Byæus devotes §§ 235—260 to a discussion of the subject.

and the persecution continuing, Dionysius was, for the time, unable to return to his flock.

But Macrianus, marching against Aurcolus, who had appeared in Illyria as a claimant of the empire, was defeated and slain by him on the borders of Thrace. Thus Egypt fell into the power of Gallienus. A rescript was immediately addressed by that emperor to "Dionysius, Primus, Demetrius,¹ and the other Bishops," permitting them to enjoy the general toleration of religious opinions, and strictly forbidding all persons to molest them on account of their belief. On this, Dionysius returned to Alexandria.

A.D. 261.

the persecution ceases at Alexandria :

But the peace enjoyed by that Church lasted only a very short time. A quarrel broke out between the soldiery and the populace on the most trifling pretence² (it is said to have arisen in a dispute between a slave and a soldier, as to whether had the better shoes). The whole city was in a state of sedition; the governor was attacked by stones, weapons, and every other missile that popular indignation supplied. Despairing of life, Æmilian, a man of parts and vigour, assumed the purple;—the army supported him;—and he had soon subdued the Thebais and the whole of Egypt. He then again returned to his metropolis. Part of the city held for Gallienus, part acknowledged Æmilian; while Theodotus besieged Alexandria with the troops of the emperor. There were two Christians,³ Eusebius and Anatolius, both natives of Alexandria, and both in course of time Bishops of Laodicea, whose actions deserve to be recorded. Eusebius was a partisan of Theodotus; Anatolius among the followers of Æmilian. That part of the city which acknowledged Gallienus was free from any further trouble than the presence of the army necessarily occasioned; while the other portion suffered all the horrors of famine. Eusebius, who dwelt in the former, receiving information from his friend of the dreadful sufferings of which he was daily eye-witness, used his influence, which was not inconsiderable, with Theodotus, to obtain a promise of safety to any one, who would abandon the usurper, and surrender himself prisoner. He gave notice of this to Anatolius,

insurrection in that city :

Æmilian assumes the purple ;

Alexandria is besieged :

Christian charity of Eusebius and Anatolius.

¹ Euseb. H. E. vii. 13. Who Primus and Demetrius were, it is impossible to discover.

² Trebellius Pollio de xxx Tyrannis, cap. 21. Euseb. H. E. vii. 21.

³ Euseb. H. E. vii. 32.

who assembled the Senate, and proposed submission to the Romans. A tumult instantly arose; but the speaker kept his place. "At least," said he, "let those who cannot be of any assistance to us, let the infants, the aged men, and the women, avail themselves of this promise of security. Weak by nature, exhausted by famine, what service can they render? They will but consume the corn which we should husband for the support of those who can fight in our defence."

The Senate assented; and multitudes took advantage of this permission to escape to the enemy's camp. The Christians, disguised as women, passed the gates and were in safety; and Eusebius took care to provide the nourishment and the medicine necessary for those who had suffered such extremity of hunger.

The Great
Plague
reappears;

Æmilian possessed nine of the public granaries; and frightful famine was followed by pestilence. We have already remarked that Alexandria, since the first ravages of the plague that had visited it from Ethiopia, had never been entirely free from it. It began in autumn, and ended about the rising of the dog star.¹ But now the new elements which unwholesome diet, want of the necessaries of life, and a crowded population, added to pre-disposition towards this disease, caused its ravages to be terrible.

A.D. 263.

Easter drew on; and still on all sides raged war, famine, and disease. "It is easier," writes Dionysius in a Paschal Epistle to Hierax, an Egyptian Bishop,²—"it is easier to travel from east to west, than from one part of Alexandria to another. The heart of the city is wilder and more pathless than that vast desert, through which Israel journeyed. The river, as in the time of Moses, seems turned into blood, and fetid;—what water can cleanse the stream itself? When will the dark and clouded air become clear and serene?"—It would appear—for the words may well be taken literally—that Alexandria was enveloped in the same dense, close, murky atmosphere that is known to have accompanied so many great plagues.

death of
Æmilian:

At length the arms of Theodotus were crowned with success; Æmilian fell into his hands, and was strangled in prison.³ But,

¹ So Cedrenus informs us. Heini-
chen, in Euseb. vii. 22.

² Euseb. H. E. 21.

³ In these dates, we follow Byæus,
whose reasoning on the subject is
most masterly. Valesius and Heini-

on the approach of another Easter, the plague appears to have A.D. 264. raged with increased violence,¹ and the subject of Dionysius's Paschal letter,² addressed to the Alexandrians in general, was Paschal Epistle of S. Dionysius. charity. He begins by remarking that to other men such a season would little seem the time for a festival; that every street and lane of the city was full of misery, that the multitude of funerals, and the countless numbers of the dying, seemed to fill all quarters of Alexandria,—that as of old in Egypt, so also now, there was not a house where there was not one,—and would there were only one!—dead. Nevertheless, as in times past persecution and tyranny could not prevent them from celebrating the Festivals of the Church, so that the desert, the ship, the prison became the House of God, (though none were so blessed as the Martyrs, who were banqueting in the Kingdom of Heaven;) so now, in the midst of sickness and death they might share in the same holy joy. The pestilence, he observes, while it had not spared the Christians, had committed the greatest ravages among the heathen. Many of the brethren had taken their lives in their hand, and attempting for the love of CHRIST to cure the sick, had died with them; others had succeeded in preserving the lives of them to whom they ministered, at the expense of their own:—they had tended their

chen, more or less closely, agree with him. The Editor of the Propaganda edition makes the letter to Hierax, and the Paschal Epistle on Charity, to have been written in the same year, 263.

¹ We thus explain an apparent contradiction between the epistle to Hierax, and that on Charity. In the former, Dionysius speaks of the plague and the war as co-existing:—in the latter, after talking of the peace which CHRIST had given to us alone, he speaks of a *βραχυτάτη ἀναπνοή* and then proceeds, *ἐπικατέσκηψεν ἡ νόσος αὐτή*. It will be observed that in the letter to Hierax he says but little of the plague, and that rather as a continuation of the pestilence that had already lasted for several years,—*οἱ*

συνεχεῖς λοιμοί.—So that, if this plague, as usual, abated at the rising of the dog-star in 263, its fresh and more terrible attack in the autumn of that year might well be spoken of as a new visitation. We prefer this explanation to another which has suggested itself to us,—that by the peace which CHRIST gave might be meant peace from persecution; without reference to anything else. The context hardly admits this: The persecution of the Pagans, says he, we suffered alone; in their civil commotions we suffered with them; and then we enjoyed the peace that CHRIST gave us alone. This difficulty has not, that we are aware, been noticed.

² Euseb. H. E. vii. 22.

persecutors, and supplied the necessities of those who had been the murderers of their brethren. Some there were, who taking up the bodies of the Saints, closing their eyes and lips, bearing them on their shoulders, washing, composing, and adorning them, had need, no long time after, that the same offices of love should be performed to themselves. The Priests and deacons especially signalled themselves in these deeds of charity;—and three of the latter, whom we have already mentioned, Faustus, Chæremon, and Eusebius, fell victims to their love. The Pagans, on the contrary, endeavoured to avoid death at the sacrifice of every tie of domestic love; they would not visit the sick, they would not bury the dead, and yet they were unable, after all, to preserve themselves.

The Confessors, who gave their lives for their brethren, are commemorated as Martyrs on the twenty-eighth day of February. Eusebius,¹ in the Coptic Calendar, is honoured by himself on the seventh of the same month.

A.D. 265.

In the ensuing summer the plague seems to have much abated;—and in his next Paschal Epistle, which was also his last, addressed to the Christians throughout Egypt,² Dionysius speaks of the city of Alexandria as at rest.

SECTION XI.

END OF S. DIONYSIUS.

WORN out with years and with his labours for the truth, Dionysius seemed but waiting for his signal to depart and to be with CHRIST, which to him was far better, when it pleased God to make manifest that His servant's continuance yet a little while in the flesh was more needful for His Church. Paul,

¹ At least, if we compare the season of the year both with that in which the Alexandrian Martyrs are celebrated, and with the real time at which the plague was at its height, (*i. e.* about the beginning of Lent) there can be little doubt that the

ⲕⲟⲩⲓⲛⲟⲩⲓ of the thirteenth of Jacatit (= Feb. 7,) is the S. Eusebius who laid down his life in the pestilence.

² Euseb. H. E. vii. 22.

surnamed from his native city, Samosata,¹ (it was situated near the Euphrates under Taurus, and is now called Sempsat,) had been raised, about the year 261, to the Chair of Antioch. He had not long enjoyed that dignity, when being consulted by the famous Zenobia, in whose power the East then almost entirely lay, on the doctrines of Christianity, he brought forward certain dogmas which, gradually acquiring form and consistency, appeared to the neighbouring Bishops nothing short of heresy. He taught that the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, formed but one Hypostasis; that the WORD and the SPIRIT were in the FATHER in the same manner that reason is in man, that is, without any real and personal existence; so that, except by a latitude of expression, it is improper to speak of either FATHER, SON, or HOLY SPIRIT,—but only generally of GOD. The SON, he argued, must be prolatitious and without hypostasis; how otherwise, such was his blasphemous sophism, could He be consubstantial with the FATHER? On any other hypothesis, he said, we assert three substances, and thus fall into a modified Tritheism. Nor was his life at all calculated to recommend his doctrine. He was arrogant, avaricious, and an affecter of novelties;—and the Presbyters of his own Church were thoroughly convinced of his unsoundness in doctrine, and worthlessness of character.

propounds a
new heresy:

A Council was convoked at Antioch to consider the question. Anxious to obtain all the assistance in their power on an affair so momentous, and which might lead to the condemnation of the third Prelate in the Church, the Priests and Bishops in and near Antioch requested the attendance of S. Dionysius and S. Firmilian,² as men unequalled in the East for theological learning and piety. Dionysius, then on his death-bed, exerted his remaining energy, and addressed the Fathers of Antioch in an epistle in which he vindicated the Catholic Faith:—and doubtless, as Bishop Bull beautifully speaks, that divine soul,³ on the eve of departing to its GOD, divinely expounded the true Divinity of the SAVIOUR. But the Epistle has perished⁴;—and

a Council is
summoned
at Antioch

S. Dionysius,
invited, but
unable to
attend,

writes to the
Fathers,

¹ Le Quien, ii. 933, 4.

² Epist. ii. Conc. Antioch. ap. Euseb. vii. 30.

³ Bull, D. F. N. ii. 11, 11.

⁴ As, in this assertion, we are contradicted by the great names of Baronius, Tillemont, and Bishop Bull, as well as by the authority of the very able

the supposititious writings of Dionysius, which pretend to supply its place, are a poor substitute for its loss.

The Council met; and Paul, by artifice and a profession of submission, at that time escaped. The Fathers, using the word

Editor of the Propaganda Edition, and Dr. Burton, it will be well to examine the question. Two writings of Dionysius to Paul remain:—one in the shape of an epistle to him; the other in reply to ten questions which he had proposed. The first of these makes mention of an earlier letter, which he had written to learn the real sentiments of the heretic. These writings were discovered at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and printed at Rome in 1608. Valesius, Dupin, Ruinart, Basnage, and others, account them spurious: and, though the question is one of difficulty, the arguments against them appear to us overpowering.

1. The Epistle of Dionysius which we have is directly addressed to Paul, and makes mention of a previous letter written to him. But the Fathers of the Second Council of Antioch, in their synodical Epistle to Dionysius of Rome and Maximus, say, that Dionysius of Alexandria wrote to Antioch, *τὸν ἡγεμόνα τῆς πλάνης οὐδὲ προσήσεως ἀξιώσας, οὐδὲ πρὸς πρόσωπον γράψας*. It is answered that the letter now in question, contains no express mention of Paul, its superscription being merely *Διονύσιος, καὶ οἱ συμπρεσβύτεροι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας, ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν*. But this does not satisfy the strong expressions of the Council; the letter mentioned by them cannot have been addressed to Paul, otherwise their language would be calculated to mislead. And, as they affixed a copy of this letter to their own epistle, the perusal of it, if identical with that which is now in question, would have convicted them of exaggeration.

2. The writer of these Epistles does not seem to have had a very clear conception of the real doctrines of Paul. Judging from his composition, that heretic must have taught that in our LORD there were Two Hypostases, Two CHRISTs, Two SONS: one of the FATHER, begotten before all worlds, the other of S. Mary, and not existing till receiving an existence from her. This is, or approximates indistinguishably to, Nestorianism;—and, therefore, it is probable that this letter was written after the Council of Ephesus;—and, perhaps, intended as a pious fraud to support Catholic Truth. This is Ceillier's argument (iii. 277): but, we confess, that though well put by itself, it does not seem to us irrefragable. To the question, how could Paul at once have taught that CHRIST was prolaticious and without hypostasis, and yet that He had Two hypostases, Garnier's solution in his dissertation on Nestorianism, prefixed to his Edition of Marius Mercator, appears more ingenious than probable. He imagines that Paul contemplated a double state in the Word, one *immanent*,—to use the language of the Schools,—the other *transient* (*ἐνδιάθετον* and *προφορικόν*): that while He was in the FATHER, He had, according to Paul, no other hypostasis than the FATHER'S; that when He was sent on earth, He began to possess a different hypostasis; but that when, having accomplished His work, He returned to the FATHER, He again was, so to speak, swallowed up and lost in the Hypostasis of GOD. This doctrine, a mixture of Nestorianism and Sabellianism, not only reconciles the supposed letter of S. Dionysius

consubstantial in the same sense that Paul had affixed to it, condemned it, as it is generally believed: at the same time that they set forth the SAVIOUR'S Divinity in the strongest and simplest terms. But four years later, the heterodoxy and malpractices of Paul being now undeniable, he was condemned and deposed; and Domnus substituted in his place.

While the first Council of Antioch was yet in deliberation, Dionysius was called to the joy of his LORD. In the February of 265 he fell asleep¹; and left behind him the reputation of

and departs
this life,
Feb. or Mar.
265.

with the accounts of Philastrius and S. Epiphanius; but has been thought to explain and to harmonize with the passages of S. Athanasius, in which he adverts to the heresy of Paul of Samosata.

3. But if, notwithstanding this explanation, any suspicion arises from the preceding objection, that the letter of S. Dionysius is in reality the work of some anti-Nestorian writer, that suspicion is very much strengthened when we observe that the title *Θεοτόκος* is six times in it applied to S. Mary. It is granted that this word was used long before the time of S. Dionysius; by Origen, for example, (Socrates, H. E. vii. 32. Origen, in S. Luc. i. 43.) and more particularly in the Church of Alexandria (Ed. Propagand. Præf. p. 27; Fabricius, B. G. v. 236.) and, no long time after Dionysius, by S. Alexander, (Theodoret, H. E. i. 4.) and, as is well known, by S. Athanasius. But an occasional use of this name is all that can be proved before the Council of Ephesus; and is very different from its adoption, six times, in the course of one epistle of no very great length,—a thing of which the writings of no other ante-Ephesine Father can furnish an example.

4. A very strong argument to the same end, is this. In this epistle Dionysius expressly applies the word *Consubstantial* to the SON of GOD; and speaks in the strongest possible

terms of His Divinity. Is it likely that S. Athanasius, when he wrote the treatise to which we have often referred, in defence of the orthodoxy of Dionysius, could have been ignorant of, or could have forgotten, these passages? Yet he nowhere quotes them; and granting that he was then obliged to write in some obscure place, where he could not procure the epistle in question, he would surely have referred to it as existing.

5. The same argument, though less strongly, applies to the Epistle of S. Basil to Maximus, to which we have already referred.

6. It is urged, and it is not denied, that the style of this letter differs from that of the other works of Dionysius; that the Scriptural arguments appear weak, and the quotations not apposite. On the whole, then, we are justified in concluding, (notwithstanding the able attempt of the Propaganda Editor to prove the contrary, and his success in shewing, from an old Latin version, that they are of great antiquity,) that the Epistles to Paul of Samosata are not really the composition of S. Dionysius.

¹ We have already given our reasons (p. 39, note *) for this date. It is singular, however, that by no Church is he commemorated in February. The Roman Martyrology assigned Nov. 17, the Greek Menology, Oct. 3, to his memory: in the Coptic

peerless learning, unshaken orthodoxy, and a character that well entitled him to his usual appellation of **THE GREAT**.

Writings of
S. Dionysius:

his canonical
epistle to
Basileides.

The loss of the writings of Dionysius is one of the greatest that has been suffered by Ecclesiastical History. Besides those that we have noticed, fragments of a Commentary on Ecclesiastes, and of a treatise against the Epicureans, on Nature, remain to us ; besides an Epistle to Basileides, which is received by the Oriental Church into its body of Canons. Basileides, a Bishop in Pentapolis, had asked Dionysius at what hour the Lent fast ended. At Rome, it appears, it did not conclude till cock-crow on Easter morning ; in Egypt, it finished on the evening of Saturday. The Patriarch observes, that to fix the time exactly was impossible ; that those are to be commended who keep vigil till the fourth watch, while they are not to be blamed who are compelled, by the weakness of their bodies, to repose themselves earlier ; that the fast, however, was not at an end till Saturday midnight. He observes that some passed six days of Holy Week without eating,—some four, some three, some two, some not one ; and while he lays down no specific rule, that he disapproves the conduct of those who make good cheer on the first four days, and think to compensate it by a strict fast on the Friday and Saturday. This canon exemplifies the wonderful rigour of these earlier ages, both in making mention of some who abstained from food during the whole week, and in simply not imputing it as a fault if any, compelled by weakness, ate daily. The second and fourth canons concern physical reasons for abstaining from the Holy Communion, and the third is on nuptial continence.

The great humility of S. Dionysius is conspicuous in the end of this epistle. You have not consulted me, says he, through ignorance, but to do me honour, and maintain peace ; you will judge my observations for yourself, and let me know your decision. We may remark, as an instance of the extraordinary power of the See of Alexandria, that S. Dionysius, though writing to a Bishop, addresses him by the title of Son,—an appellation not used in the like sense, even by Rome.

Calendar, Sept. 14 is dedicated to him ; but March 9 is mentioned as the day of his decease. If the latter should be, as it may be, correct ; we

may reconcile all accounts by supposing Philip to have begun his reign not, with most historians, at the beginning, but at the end of March, 247.

SECTION XII.

S. MAXIMUS AND S. THEONAS.

MAXIMUS,¹ whom we have already had occasion to mention as the companion, was also the successor of S. Dionysius. The uneventful annals of this Patriarch prove that the Church of Alexandria, after her long afflictions, enjoyed some repose. The persecution of Aurelian either did not extend to, or did not rage in Egypt. The occasions on which this prelate appears in Ecclesiastical History are two only. The first is in the superscription of the synodical epistle, written by the Fathers of the Second Council of Antioch, when, as we have already seen, Paul of Samosata was deposed. That letter is addressed to Dionysius of Rome, and Maximus of Alexandria. The second is a letter² written to him by S. Felix of Rome, the successor of Dionysius, on the subject of the heresy, which survived the deposition, of Paul.

S. Maximus,
Patr. XV.,
succeeds
A.D. 265:

Having governed his Church³ more than seventeen years, Maximus was called to his rest; and some internal divisions, if we may trust an obscure tradition,⁴ troubled Alexandria, which

his death:
A.D. 282.

¹ He is called Maximinian by Nicephorus.

² Sollerius, § 170. A fragment of this Epistle was read in the Council of Ephesus.

³ Eusebius, (H. E. vii. 32,) says eighteen, by which, perhaps, he means more than seventeen: Makrizi, (§ 98) twelve: the *Chronicon Orientale*, twelve years and nine months: Euty-chius (i. 392) eighteen: Nicephorus and Georgius Syncellus, eight, (perhaps by a false reading of η for ιγ): Abu'lberkat, more correctly, seventeen years and five months. The date of his death, 282, is fixed, as well by the context of Alexandrian chronology, as by the assertion of the *Chronicon Orientale*, that it took place on Sunday, Barmuda xiv, (= April 9) which

makes the Dominical letter A, and gives 282 as the year.

⁴ This appears from Abu'lberkat, who, in the words of his translator, says, Post Maximum, nescio quis Bebnudensis factus est Patriarcha; at cum seipsum castrasset, gradu dejectum, ideoque ex Patriarcharum catalogo expunctum dicunt. *Quidam Bebnudensis* is a false translation of Wanslebius, for "one Bebnuda,"—or Paphnutius. This story is confirmed by the *Chronicon Orientale*, that the See was vacant a year, a thing which cannot easily be otherwise accounted for;—but is rendered improbable by the fact, that when the Jacobites, as we shall see, wanted a precedent for the deposition of Cyril ben Laklak, they could find none.

schism at
Alexandria :

S. Theonas,
Patr. XVI.,
A.D. 382.

were at length composed by the elevation of Theonas¹ to the Evangelical Chair. The new Patriarch found his flock suffering from a local persecution ; but he courageously exposed himself to public observation : and at length, if we may believe Euty-chius, obtained leave to build a church.²

Achilleus
assumes the
purple at
Alexandria.

The Episcopate of this Patriarch was a time of much suffering to the Egyptians. In its ninth year,³ Achilleus assumed the purple at Alexandria, and held it for six years. The city was taken by Diocletian after an eight months' siege : its walls were levelled with the ground, and the usurper and many who had favoured, or were suspected of favouring, his interests, put to death. The whole of Egypt suffered severely : death, exile, and fine were inflicted on many of the principal inhabitants in its various cities.

S. Theonas
writes to
Lucian

We possess an Epistle⁴ of Theonas ;—and the prudence and piety which it exhibits may well make us deplore that we have but one. It was apparently written towards the beginning of the reign of Diocletian, and is addressed to Lucian, chief of the gentlemen of the bed-chamber. “The peace,” says the Bishop, “which the Churches now enjoy, is granted to this end ; that

¹ The Æthiopic Calendar calls him **ἸΩΑΝΝΗΣ**. Pococke, by a fault in the MS. of Euty-chius, Neron, (Compare Euty-chius i. 399, with Renaudot 53). See also Cuperus the Bollandist (August, iv. 397).

² Euty-chius i. 397. He adds that it was dedicated in honour of S. Mary, and Severus asserts that it was called Tamaoutha, that is, as Renaudot conjectures, *θαύματα*, from the miracles performed there, though others, as the editor of S. Dionysius, explain it to mean, the Mother of God. The Ethiopians speak of it as a tower. But it is difficult to believe that such a dedication took place at so early a period. The tradition, however, was very widely credited ; and the Ethiopic Calendar on the second of June, celebrates, as a great festival, **ἡμέρα τῆς ἐκτίσεως τῆς ἐκκλησίας** : the Dedic-

tion of the Temple of Mary. Cuperus agrees with these authorities.

³ Pagi. Critic. 296. vii.

⁴ This Epistle, which only exists in a Latin Translation, was first published by D'Achery in the xii. volume of his *Specilegium* (p. 545). It bears as its title, *An Epistle of Theonas the Bishop*. D'Achery himself did not believe it to have been the writing of the Bishop of Alexandria, but his reasons are not strong : the principal being an argument from the hostility of Diocletian to the Christian name, and the consequent improbability of his having Christian courtiers. But at the beginning of his reign, Diocletian, as every one knows, favoured the Christians. Cuperus seems to have demonstrated the great probability (to say the least) that the letter was written by Theonas of Alexandria, § iii. It is given in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. iii. p. 307, seq., 1st edition.

the good works of Christians may shine out before infidels, and that thence our FATHER, Which is in heaven, may be glorified. This should be our chief end and aim, if we would be Christians in deed, and not in word only. For, if we seek our own glory, we desire a vain and perishable thing: but the glory of the FATHER and of the SON, Who for us was nailed to the Cross, saves us with an everlasting redemption,—that great expectation of Christians. I neither think therefore, nor wish, my Lucian, that you should boast, because many in the Court have come, by your means, to the knowledge of the truth: you should rather give thanks to God, Who hath chosen you as a good instrument to a good result, and hath given you favour in the sight of the Prince, to the end that you should spread abroad the savour of the Christian name, to His glory and to the salvation of many.” Having dwelt on the necessity of avoiding every thing that might cast a stumbling block in the way of Diocletian, “God forbid,” he proceeds, “that you should sell to any the entry of the Palace, or receive a bribe to suggest what is unseemly to the Emperor’s ear. Put away from you all avarice, which worketh idolatry, rather than the Christian religion. Unworthy gain, and duplicity is much unbefitting him who embraces CHRIST, the Poor and the Simple. Let there be no evil speaking, nor immodest language among you. Let all things be done with kindness, courtesy, and justice: that in all things the Name of our God and LORD JESUS CHRIST may be magnified. Fulfil the duties to which you are severally appointed with fear towards God, and love towards the Emperor, and exactness and diligence. Account that all commands of the Prince, which offend not against those of God, proceed from God Himself. Put on patience as a robe: be filled with virtue and the hope of CHRIST.”

on the duties
of a Christ-
ian courtier:

He then proceeds to the particular duties of those whom he is addressing:—one of whom, it appears, had the charge of the privy purse;—another of the wardrobe,—a third of the gold and silver vessels. The post of librarian was not yet filled up: but the Bishop gives directions, in case a Christian should be nominated to it, for the proper discharge of that function. The librarian should acquaint himself with the principal orators, poets, and historians of antiquity. He should, as occasion served, intro-

duce the mention of the Septuagint as a book that had attracted the attention of a King of Egypt, and might not be unworthy the perusal of an Emperor of Rome. The books which Diocletian most frequently read should be well arranged, and transcribed from the most correct copies, or amended by learned men; they should be handsomely, but not sumptuously, written, and the affectation of purple membranes and gold letters, (unless the Emperor expressly commanded it,) should be avoided. The Bishop concludes with general exhortations for behaviour towards Diocletian, for cheerfulness, submission, and the utmost complaisance that the Law of GOD did not forbid;—at the same time, retirement must be found for prayer, and for the reading of the Scriptures, “which will enable you,”—thus the letter concludes, —“to fulfil your duties in the love of CHRIST, and to despise all things transitory for the sake of His Eternal Promises, and shall conduct you to the attainment of everlasting felicity.”

his death.
A. D. 300.

History records nothing further of this Prelate¹: he was summoned from his labours towards the beginning of January, 300²; and was surnamed by his people *The Column of the Church*.³ The Alexandrian school, during his time under the management of Peter, the succeeding Patriarch, still retained its fame, as it had done since the Mastership of S. Dionysius, under the succession of Clemens II., Pierius, Theognostus, and Scrapion.

¹ The Arabic writers will have it that, in his time, Sabellius the heresiarch came to Alexandria, and entering the church in which the Bishop was sitting, challenged him to a dispute on the Faith, promising, in case himself were confuted, to return to the Catholic Church; and requiring, if he were victorious, that Theonas should embrace Sabellianism. The latter, thinking such a controversy beneath his own dignity, committed it to Peter, one of his priests and his successor: and Sabellius loudly complained of the haughtiness of the Prelate, in not entering the lists, and appointing so youthful a substitute. Peter replied, in the words of David, “Thou comest to me with a

sword, and with a spear, and with a shield, but I come to thee in the Name of the LORD of Hosts, the GOD of the House of Israel, Whom thou hast defied.” The dispute began, and the Catholic champion was carrying conviction to the hearts of all the bystanders, when Sabellius was seized with an apoplexy, and fell down dead. The greater part of this tale is certainly fabulous, and probably the whole is so: though it is likely enough that Sabellius may, at an earlier period, as having been a native of Pentapolis, have endeavoured to propagate his tenets in Alexandria.

² Euseb. H. E. vii. 32, close to the end.

³ Ludolf, Comm. p. 404. note (e.)

More particularly, Pierius¹ enjoyed great reputation as a teacher of philosophy, and left so many learned treatises on various subjects, as to acquire the title of the second Origen. He survived the persecution of Diocletian, and took up his abode in Rome, where he died.

One remarkable epoch dates from the Patriarchate of Theonas. It is well known that the ancient Alexandrian Church did not reckon its years from the Incarnation, but from the Era of Martyrs: that is, from the first year of the reign of Diocletian, that reign which sent so many Martyrs to Paradise. The Coptic Communion still employs that computation; the orthodox Alexandrian Church has long disused it; exchanging it, as almost all other national customs, for the use of Constantinople. In future, we shall employ both one and the other reckoning.²

¹ S. Hieron. Catal. ii. 915, Præf. in Os. 6. xxiii. xxiv.

² Scaliger, as is well known, reckons the Era of Martyrs, from the nineteenth year of Diocletian. Renaudot clearly shews that it is to be computed from the beginning of his reign (p. 62): and so does Sollerius, p. 33.* Diocletian, as is amply proved by Petavius, Labbé, Pagi, and Bucherius, began to reign Sep. 17, 284: but the Era of Martyrs begins from the 29th of August of that year. Gregory Abu'l-Pharaj is clear on the date of the era, p. 133 (84 of Pococke's translation). Renaudot is certainly mistaken in say-

ing that the Ethiopic Church uses the same computation, and calls it the Era of Grace. He quotes Ludolf; but Ludolf says no such thing. An Egyptian Ecclesiastic, writing in 1707, called it **በርዩ ዮወጊዳህተ: መስረተ:** that is, the Year of Grace, 7207. Now the Ethiopians compute 5500 from the creation of the world till the Incarnation: thus the year of Grace is here evidently the year of the World, however it may at other times have been used. Renaudot seems to follow Scaliger.

SECTION XIII.

PERSECUTION OF DIOCLETIAN.

S. Peter
Martyr:
Patr. XVII.,
A.D. 300.
A.M. 16.

HITHERTO, however illustriously her Prelates had confessed the truth, and however boldly they had testified, even before the tribunal, to the Name of CHRIST, the Evangelical Throne of Alexandria had never been filled by a Martyr. Of the other two great Sees, Rome¹ could claim that glorious title for sixteen or seventeen of her Pontiffs: Antioch, for at least two of her Prelates. Alexandria was now to be counted worthy of the same honour.

his con-
secration:

The infancy of Peter is, by the oriental writers,² ornamented with many fables. They inform us, that he was ordained Priest at the age of seventeen, and nominated by the dying Theonas as his successor: events unlikely in themselves, and not based on any satisfactory authority. From these authors, however, we gain an additional testimony (were it needed) against the misstatement of Eutychius, with respect to the Presbyteral College founded by S. Mark. S. Peter was constituted Patriarch, we are told by Severus, by the imposition of the hands of the Alexandrian clergy and laity. But that the laity ordained as Bishop, is evidently an absurd statement, and the words must therefore be understood of election.

Meletius,
Bishop of
Lycopolis,

S. Peter's first act was not only attended with considerable trouble to himself, but was fraught with momentous consequences to the Church of Egypt. The See of Lycopolis,³ situate on the northern boundary of the Thebais, appears to have possessed

¹ Nothing shews more clearly the comparative exemption of Alexandria from the earlier persecutions, than the fact that at the commencement of the tenth, twenty-nine Pontiffs had already governed Rome, while there had been

a succession of but seventeen in Egypt.

² Renaudot, p. 51.

³ Le Quien, ii. 598. Pliny, H. N. v. 9. Wansleb. 24. It is now called Siut, or Osiut, and is a Coptic See.

some honorary pre-eminence over the other bishoprics¹ of the Diocese of Alexandria. Alexander,² who during the time of Theonas, had filled that See, had distinguished himself by a work against the Manichæans, which still exists. His successor was Meletius, a man of far different character. He had for some time been a cause of scandal, from the crimes of which he was suspected, and at length, in some local persecution, or perhaps popular insurrection, he renounced the faith, and sacrificed to idols.³ On this, Peter convoked a Council at Alexandria, by which the offending Bishop was convicted and deposed. Meletius, however, was by no means willing to submit to the sentence. Instead of appealing to another Council, he separated himself from the

apostatizes :

is deposed,
A.D. 301 :*

¹ S. Epiphanius, Hær. 68, (where he is, unconsciously, using Meletian documents,) says, *τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον προήκων, καὶ δευτερέων τῷ Πέτρῳ τῷ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπῇν*. And again, Hær. 69, *Μελέτιος ὁ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀπὸ Θηβαίδος δοκῶν εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸς ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*. Renaudot rejects these accounts as mere falsehoods, contrived by the Meletians, for the propagation of their schism. But not to say that this does not seem a thing capable of invention, it affords some grounds for the rapid spread of the schism, if we allow the superior dignity of its first mover. For Tillemont's hypothesis, *il estoit le premier eveque de toute l'Egypte apres S. Pierre, peuestre par son antiquité*, (V. 3. ii. Ed. 1707,) there seems no ground whatever.

² Photius de Manich. Bibl. Coiss. Cod. 270, p. 354.

³ This fact is denied by Basnage and others. They found their arguments on the silence of S. Epiphanius, who accounts Meletius an illustrious Confessor : and also in the fact that the Fathers of Nicæa, while laying other crimes to the charge of Meletius, say nothing of his Apostacy, which, if true, would have been the gravest of all. The account of Epiphanius is so

evidently extracted from falsified documents, that much weight cannot be attached to it : while the silence at Nicæa may simply arise from the difficulty at such a distance, (both of time and space,) of convicting Meletius. Such arguments cannot avail against the express and positive declaration of S. Athanasius.

* The date of the Meletian schism has been much contested. S. Athanasius, in his encyclic epistle against the Arians, asserts that fifty-five years had then elapsed since its commencement. Baronius, and, though less decidedly, Tillemont, fix the date of that epistle to A.D. 362, which would make the schism to have broken out towards the end of A.D. 306. But Pagi, (306. xxix.) and the Benedictine Editors of S. Athanasius, prove incontestably that the encyclic epistle was written in 356, which gives 301 for the date of the schism. As to Tillemont's argument (V. 3, 381, note viii.) that this date is impossible, because the tenth persecution had not then commenced, whereas Meletius had already apostatized, it is easy to reply, that he did so in some local persecution ; for such were not unfrequent during the whole reign of Diocletian.

Communion of the Church ; and thus obtained the miserable renown of being the first leader of a schism at Alexandria, as Novatian had been at Rome. Like Novatian, too, he professed to separate himself from Peter, on account of the too great facility with which the latter re-admitted apostates.

raises a
schism:

To strengthen his party, Meletius took upon himself to ordain Bishops of his own sect : and he consecrated as many as thirty, one of whom arrogated to himself the title of Bishop of Alexandria. Meletius further claimed a total exemption from Patriarchal jurisdiction,¹ and pretended, it would seem, to confer this exemption on others. To what cause we are to attribute the rapid spread of his schism, it is not easy to divine : possibly the distance of Lycopolis from Alexandria, and the then recent accession of Peter, may have been favourable to its growth. We have already observed, that the Patriarch was the only Archbishop (till the conversion of Ethiopia), in his own Diocese ; and this rendered the attempt of Meletius still more unjustifiable.

his tenets :

The schism soon began to develope into heresy ;—and the monks who attached themselves to it, were foremost in this advance. They are accused of Judaical observances in respect of ceremonial purifications ; of mixing dances and unseemly motions in the service of God : of looking for a Heaven that abounded with sensual delights. It is possible that, in process of time, they were guilty of some innovation in the Form of Baptism : for S. Peter, as we are informed by Sozomen,² refused them as invalid.

Not content with the propagation of his sect, Meletius spread the most unfounded calumnies against his Patriarch. And these reports had a wide circulation, and enjoyed considerable credit ; for we find S. Epiphanius himself misled by them.

he is joined
by Arius.

One of the principal adherents of Meletius was Arius, a native of Libya.³ This man, even then distinguished by his powers of argument and persuasion, in a short time reconciled himself to

¹ Socrates, H. E. i. 6. Sozomen, H. E. i. 15, 24. Theodoret, i. 8.

² Sozomen, H. E. i. 15. Πέτρον τὸ αὐτῶν βάπτισμα μὴ προσιεμένον. It seems impossible to take this as Baro-
nius, (306. li.) following Nicephorus,

8. 5, does, that Peter simply forbade the Meletians to baptize : because this, and so much more, was included in their excommunication.

³ Sozomen, H. E. i. 15.

the Church, and was ordained Deacon by S. Peter. But when the latter excommunicated Meletius and his partizans, Arius exclaimed against his tyranny, and was so pertinacious in his opposition, that the Bishop suspended him from the exercise of his office.

And now the greatest and the last of the persecutions was drawing on.

S. Peter had not sat fully three years, when Diocletian, urged on by Galerius, commenced the last and the most bloody persecution.¹ By a first edict, issued at Nicomedia towards the end of February, he commanded the demolition of the churches, and the destruction of the sacred books. A second rescript ordered the imprisonment of all Ecclesiastics; a third, which followed close upon it, the death of all that should refuse to sacrifice. In the beginning of the next year, a fourth and more stringent edict, against all Christians, of all stations whatsoever, was published; and then the persecution began to grow tremendous in Egypt and the Thebais.

Diocletian commences the great Tenth Persecution: Feb. 23, A.D. 303.

Of these illustrious Confessors of CHRIST we must speak, not as their acts deserve, but as the analogy of history will permit. Eusebius was himself a spectator of the courage of some Egyptian Martyrs who were crowned at Tyre.² After being lacerated with the scourge, they were exposed to the fury of leopards, bears, and boars, and these animals were irritated by strokes and fire. But they either refused to attack the Christians, or were repelled by some invisible force; and, as in revenge, sprung on the Pagan keepers of the arena and commissioners of the games. One youth stood calmly awaiting their onset, extending his arms in the form of a Cross, and occupied in prayer;—the animals could not be induced to attack him.

Egyptian Martyrs at Tyre.

Eusebius visited Alexandria while many of its inhabitants remembered the terrors of this period³; and professes himself perfectly unable to recount the names of even the chief Martyrs. In the Thebais, more especially, day after day, month after

Second year: its violence in the Thebais:

¹ In the chronology of this persecution, so far as respects Egypt, Tillemont seems more satisfactory than other historians: Baronius and Fleury are guilty of several palpable inaccuracies.

² Euseb. H. E. viii. 7.

³ Euseb. H. E. viii. 9. The Martyrs of the Thebais are celebrated in the Western Church on the 5th day of January. Their number is reckoned, in ancient Martyrologies, at 144,000; and that of the Confessors at 700,000, which seems a great exaggeration.

month, and year after year, the executioners went on: fifty, eighty, a hundred fell daily; the executioners were wearied out with slaughter, and relieved each other by gangs; in some instances, the axe was worn out by use; all kinds of tortures were employed: some were crucified; some suspended in the air by the feet; some burnt; some drowned; some were tied to two trees, bent together by mechanical force, and torn asunder by them when that force was relaxed; some rent by hooks of iron, some with potsherds. The Pagans themselves took pity on the sufferers, and as far as they could, sheltered and concealed them; but many Christians were unwilling thus to be deprived of the glory of Martyrdom. The apostacy, so prevalent in the Decian persecution, was now scarcely heard of; women and children confessed CHRIST joyfully; many were thrown into prison, mutilated, and dragged through the streets; many looked cheerfully on the deaths of those they held dearest.

Martyrdom
of S. Asclas,
Jan. 21.

The first of the Egyptian Martyrs under Diocletian,¹ with whose name and acts we are acquainted, was Asclas.² A native of Antinöus in the Thebais, he was arrested at the command of the magistrate Arrian, himself, at a later period, a Confessor of CHRIST. On refusing to sacrifice, he was tortured with the iron combs till his flesh hung down in strips; and even then would return no answer to the interrogatories of the magistrate. Bizanon, a professor of oratory, who stood by, suggested that the prisoner was senseless; on which S. Asclas replied, My senses have not left me, nor will I leave the God That made me. The Confessor was removed to Hermopolis, and there subjected to the torture of the lamps; until Arrian, owning himself conquered, said, As I think, you are about to die. S. Asclas replied, Though I die, I shall live again. A stone was attached to his neck, and he was thrown into the river. He suffered on the same day that S. Agnes confessed at Rome. At the same time S. Leonides obtained his Crown.

S. Apollonius, a monk of great eminence, occupied himself in

¹ Unless S. Mennas, whose whole history is extremely uncertain, as also the country in which he confessed, is entitled to that honour. See Tillemont v. 3, 91.

² His Acts, which appear somewhat interpolated, are in Bollandus, under January 21. See also Petrus de Natalibus, iii. 16. Baronius, against the testimony of all the Acts, places his confession under Maximin, in 310.

visiting and comforting his brethren ; many were encouraged by his persuasion to stand firm. Philemon, a great favourite of the people for his skill on the flute, met him one day in the city of Antinöus, and began to revile him ; the monk only besought God to have mercy on his slanderer and not to impute his words to him. The gentleness of his answer so touched Philemon that he hastened to the magistrate, and confessed himself a Christian ; the latter, unwilling to deprive the people of their favourite, tried to pass over the matter as a fit of insanity. Finding him, however, in earnest, he condemned him, in company with his seducer, as he termed Apollonius, to be burnt alive. When they were at the stake, the monk besought God's deliverance from that horrible death. The words were no sooner uttered than a moist cloud surrounded the pile and extinguished the fire. Arrian, and great part of the spectators, professed themselves Christians on the spot. They were summoned to Alexandria, and by the prefect's order thrown into the sea ; thus being supplied, say their Acts, with a Baptism which the Augustal little intended to give them.¹

of SS. Apollonius and Philemon.

Notwithstanding the ferocity of the persecution at Alexandria, the tendency of the faithful was rather to over-rashness than to over-prudence. Both in Egypt and the Thebais, men of property, of rank, and learning, gladly renounced all ; came forward to confess CHRIST, and were found among the Martyrs.

The Confession of S. Theodora was attended with some remarkable circumstances. She was of high birth, and equally celebrated in Alexandria for her family and for her beauty. Eustratus Proculus, the judge, urged her not to disgrace her ancestors, nor to despise the rites they had used ; in consideration of her youth and noble extraction, he allowed her three

of SS. Theodora and Didymus :

¹ The date of this Martyrdom is much disputed ; and there is much confusion in the facts. That S. Philemon suffered under Diocletian seems clear from the consent of the best Martyrologies. Bollandus, Jan. 28. See also Rufinus, De Vit. Patt. cap. 19 ; Ruinart, 486. There is another account of this event, preserved by Simeon Metaphrastes ; but, from the known character of that writer, less worthy of credit than the above. In

it Apollonius is said to have been a reader, who was equally afraid to apostatize, and to endure Martyrdom. He therefore gave Philemon a sum of money, in order that the latter might personate him, and sacrifice in his name. Philemon came before the magistrate with this design ; but in his very presence was persuaded of the truth of the Christian religion, professed himself a Christian, and suffered Martyrdom.

days to make her recantation. On the expiration of that term, finding her still resolute, the judge ordered that she should be conveyed to one of those sinks of iniquity with which Alexandria abounded, and tauntingly inquired, whether the God Whom she worshipped could now save her? Theodora, on entering the place, prayed that He Who had delivered S. Peter from prison would be pleased to manifest His Power in preserving her from all contamination. A Christian, named Didymus, who had heard the sentence, disguised himself as a soldier, and entering the house, was admitted to the chamber where the prisoner was confined, when he discovered his true design, by urging her to take his military cloak and cap, and, under that disguise, to make her escape. She did so; and in the course of an hour, a Pagan having come in, was astonished at finding a man, seated by himself. Having heard much of the miracles wrought by the SAVIOUR, he cried out that a woman had here been changed into a man, and fled with consternation. The Augustal Prefect, informed of the truth, threatened to put Didymus to the torture if he refused to discover where S. Theodora was. The prisoner replied that he knew not: this only he knew, that she was a servant of the Most High God, Who had preserved her spotless. The judge commanded him to sacrifice, and threatened him with double punishment, as a Christian, and as having abetted the escape of a prisoner. Finding him firm, he ordered that he should be beheaded. As Didymus was being conveyed to the place of execution, S. Theodora, hearing what had passed, hastened to the spot, and disputed with him the guilt of disobeying the laws, and the glory of Martyrdom. They were beheaded together; and are together reckoned among the Saints.

Third year :
lull in the
persecution :
resignation
of Diocle-
tian.

The violence of the persecution was lulled for a short time by the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian. Galerius and Constantius succeeded to the purple: but the former possessed all the real authority, and his nephew Daïa, one of the Cæsars, who had adopted the name of Maximin, a young man of semi-barbarous extraction, had the government of the East. He prided himself as being the most vigorous opponent of Christianity that had yet appeared. The persecution then recommenced with redoubled fury.

Phileas,¹ Bishop of Thmuis, one of the most important cities of Augustamnica Prima, now an inconsiderable town, and known by the name of Tmāic, came to Alexandria, probably to concert some measures with S. Peter for the government of their flocks during this dreadful crisis. While in the metropolis, he addressed an exhortation to his Church, of which a portion has been preserved by Eusebius.

Fourth year:
persecution
renewed :
S. Phileas
visits
Alexandria :

“The Martyrs,”—so he writes,—“fixing the eye of their soul simply and entirely on the God That is over all, and welcoming death for piety’s sake, held fast their calling ; for they knew that our LORD JESUS CHRIST became man for us, to the end that He might utterly destroy all iniquity, and might lay up for us a provision for our entrance into Eternal Life : for He thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but emptied Himself, and took the form of a slave, and being found in fashion like a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore desiring the greater grace, these Martyrs, filled with CHRIST, endured every labour, and all devices of insult, not once only, but some have already done so twice ; and setting at nought all the threats, not in words only, but in deeds also, of the soldiers that emulously exerted themselves in actions of cruelty, they flinched not from their resolution. What account may suffice to describe their courage, and their manliness under each torture ? For since all that would had full permission to insult them, some were struck with clubs, some with lashes, some with thongs, others with reeds.”—The Bishop proceeds to describe the tortures inflicted on these noble athletes ; how some, stretched on the *equuleus*, had every portion of their body lacerated with combs and pincers of iron ; how others were suspended by one hand from the summit of a pillar, and in the tension of their sinews and dislocation of their joints endured a torment greater than any other suffering ; how others, torn with a thousand wounds, were thrown into prison, if perchance protracted agony might weaken their resolution.

his exhorta-
tion on
Martyrdom :

As Easter,² in the fourth year of the persecution, drew on, S.

¹ Ruinart, Act. Sinc. 473, who places the confession of S. Phileas after 306, as does Tillemont.

² Can. Pen. S. Pet. Labbe i. 955.—Can. Orient. 334. (By this work, to which we shall often have occasion to

Peter was pressed by those who had lapsed to appoint them some canonical penance, and to re-admit them, on its accomplishment, into the Church. Some had now been excluded from Communion for three years, and were anxious once more to be received as penitents; the rather, that their lives were still in hourly danger from the persecution. The Epistle which S. Peter wrote on this occasion is received into the canons of the Oriental Church. In the Coptic Communion, it is interpolated with directions for the re-admission of such as had apostatized to Mahometanism:—the Syriac Version is free from such additions, and contains a fragment on Penitence, between the XIIIth and XIVth canons, which does not appear in the Greek.

The Ist Canon ordains that those who, after boldly confessing CHRIST, and suffering the torture, had at length yielded through the infirmity of the flesh, should, in consideration of the time they had already been excluded from the Church, be received at the ensuing Easter, on condition of observing the then commencing Lent with extraordinary devotion. By the IIInd, those who, without enduring tortures, had fallen away, from the tedium of imprisonment, are enjoined penitence for another year. By the IIIrd, those who had endured neither torture nor imprisonment, are, after the example of the barren fig tree, sentenced to four years' more exclusion. The IVth is not, strictly speaking, a canon; but a lamentation over those whose apostacy had not been followed by penitence. The Vth appoints six months' further penitence to such as had feigned themselves epileptic, or had hired Pagans to personate them and to sacrifice, and had thus received a certificate of having obeyed the edict. The VIth and VIIth treat of the case where masters had compelled Christian slaves to sacrifice in their place. The masters are condemned to three more years, the slaves, to one, of penitence. The VIIIth receives at once such as having lapsed, returned to the conflict, confessed, and came off with life. In the IXth, S. Peter receives to Communion, while he blames their conduct, those who had presented themselves at the Tribunal. They considered not, he says, the meaning of the prayer, "Lead us

refer, we intend the Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηός, the latest edition of the Oriental Canons, put forth with the

approbation of the Patriarch of Constantinople, by Constantine Gkarpolas. Athens. 1841.)

not into temptation"; they laid not to heart His example, Who waited till His enemies came to take Him; they listened not to His Voice, "When they persecute you in one city, flee ye to another." In like manner, they followed not in the steps of S. Stephen and S. James, of S. Peter and S. Paul. By the Xth, Clerks, hurried on by the same indiscreet zeal, are pardoned, on condition of applying themselves for the future to their respective duties. But if they had lapsed, though afterwards they had returned to the conflict, they are received to lay Communion only. The XIth Canon is an explanation of the IXth, and declares bystanders excepted from it, who, during the examination or torture of a Martyr, had found themselves carried away by a generous ardour of imitating him, and had confessed before the magistrate. The XIIth and XIIIth exempt from blame—in opposition to the hard opinion of the Montanists—those who had paid a sum of money, and thus escaped confession; and those who had evaded it by flight. The XIVth allows those to be honoured as Confessors, and elevated to the Priesthood, who had been compelled by force to swallow wine offered to idols, or to throw incense on the altar. These Canons were ratified by the Quinisext Council. It is to be remembered that those of them which enjoin penance, pre-suppose three years to have been already spent in it.

S. Phileas¹ was now called to make good indeed his exhortation to Martyrdom. He was arrested by order of Culcianus, the Prefect, who was extremely anxious that he should be

¹ The date and locality of the suffering of SS. Phileas and Philoromus are attended with great difficulty. According to Baronius, they confessed in the first year of the persecution; but there is no authority for this statement, except a mistranslation of Eusebius. But S. Jerome says expressly that S. Phileas suffered under the same tyrant as S. Lucian: that is to say, Maximin. As Maximin began to reign in May, 305, and S. Phileas suffered in February, it must have been in 306, at the earliest. Tillemont and others make another difficulty. Culcian (S. Epiphani. Hær. 68) was governor of the

Thebais when the Meletian schism commenced; but Phileas suffered under him when he was governor of Lower Egypt, *i. e.*, after he had been governor of Thebais, else he would have descended from a superior to an inferior government. If the schism commenced in 306, as Tillemont fixes it, this makes the Martyrdom of S. Phileas at least a year later. But we have already shown that this was not the case. Some (as, at one time, Valesius,) make him to have suffered in the Thebais. But this is impossible. 1. Because he wrote his exhortation in Alexandria, just before his Martyr-

his own
Confession,
with that of
S. Philoro-
mus.

induced to apostatize, because he had acquired great reputation from the study of philosophy, was of a noble family, and possessed considerable wealth. He argued with him at great length, urging him at least to offer sacrifice to his own God; setting before him the example of Moses, who offered burnt offerings. Failing in this attempt, he inquired if S. Paul had not denied the Resurrection of the Flesh; if he had not been a persecutor of the Church; if he were wiser than Plato? If conscience were his motive for refusing, did not conscience, he inquired, also forbid to leave wife and children in distress, and to disobey the Emperor? Was JESUS CHRIST, he further interrogated, Very God? How was the prisoner persuaded of it? How could the Crucified be God? The governor then boasted of his clemency towards Phileas, who thanked him for it; he informed him plainly that had he been less wealthy, he would not have taken so much pains to convince him by gentle measures, but he was unwilling to deprive the numerous poor, who were fed by his alms, of their only resource. As he continued to argue and to entreat the Bishop to have compassion on his wife, who was standing by, Philoromus, a magistrate of Alexandria, who was present, inquired why the Governor endeavoured to render Phileas faithless to his God, and how he could hope by the miserable persuasions of earth, to divert him from the eternal weight of glory, to which he was looking forward? He was instantly arrested, and the two were, by the Governor's order, led forth to be beheaded. At the place of execution, S. Phileas, turning to the east, exhorted his hearers

dom (*ὅσον οὕτω τελειωθησόμενος*); and 2. Because in the Acts, Culcian says that he could have punished him at Thmuis. But Thmuis was in Lower Egypt, not in the Thebais; therefore Culcian was then governor of Lower Egypt, not of the Thebais. It is strange that another point has not been remarked, which seems to fix the date. S. Phileas was absent from his See, in time of persecution, and just before Lent. Here are two extraordinary circumstances, which seem to require an explanation. Doubtless S. Peter summoned him to Alexandria, to give his

advice as to the reception of penitents, on which he was about to decide. S. Phileas, therefore, came up to Alexandria, towards the end of January, 306; at the conclusion of that month he wrote to his flock; and on February 4, 306, he received his reward. Eusebius speaks of Phileas as a Bishop that suffered with S. Peter (H. E. viii. 13): but there must either have been two of the same name, or the historian must there be mentioning together the names of the Bishops of Egypt who had suffered in the time of S. Peter.

to watch over their own hearts, to be on their guard against the great Enemy, to suffer for the SAVIOUR, and to remember His own precepts. "Let us call," he concluded, "on Him Who is spotless, and incomprehensible, and sitteth upon the Cherubim, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last : to Him be glory for ever and for ever. Amen." On finishing these words, he and his companion were beheaded.

In the fifth year of the persecution, the Prefects, wearied out by the interminable Confessions to which they were every day witness, began to content themselves with the punishment of mutilation instead of death.¹ Multitudes lost an eye, and were branded, and then sent to labour in the mines ; and some experienced the same fate after having undergone the torture. Among the most illustrious of these Confessors was S. Paphnuthius,² a Bishop in Upper Thebais, of whom we shall have in the sequel to speak more at length.

Mutilation
of Confes-
sors :

In the following years,³ whole armies of the Confessors were sent from the Thebais, and condemned to the mines in Palestine and Phœnicia. At one time we meet with ninety-seven, at another, with one hundred and thirty of these Christian heroes, sent into banishment ; and three Egyptians, Ares, Promus, and Elias, sealed the truth with their blood at Ascalon. In like manner, two Bishops of Egypt, with a Priest named Elias, and Paternuthius, whom Eusebius mentions as known far and wide by his charity, suffered by fire in Palestine. Thirty-nine Christians, the greater part from the Patriarchate of Alexandria, laid down their lives at Gaza. And, towards the close of the persecution, four Bishops, Hesychius, Phileas,⁴ Pachymius,⁵ and Theodorus, with many priests and laymen, were crowned at Alexandria. It would seem that this S. Hesychius was the same of whom S. Jerome writes,⁶ and who published a new edition of the LXX.

Martyrdoms
in Palestine:

¹ S. Chrysost. Hom. in Mart. Egypt. Tillemont, v. 3, 119.

² Baronius, 310, xxiii.

³ Euseb. H. E. 8, 13.

⁴ We have already given our reasons for believing that this S. Phileas was a different Prelate from him who suffered with S. Philoromus.

⁵ The Acts of S. Peter call him Pachoromus ; and add that the number of their fellow Martyrs was 660, which Valesius (Euseb. H. E. ix. 6,) seems to credit.

⁶ Baronius, 306, liii.

Towards the conclusion¹ of the persecution, an event happened, which, though somewhat uncertain in a few of its details, is, in its general character, undoubtedly true. Mennas, an Athenian of consummate wisdom and prudence, was entrusted by Maximin with the Augustal Prefecture. He used his influence and talents, and, it is said, his power of miracles, to propagate the Faith, to which he had been converted; and, in consequence, Hermogenes, also an Athenian, was sent out to supersede and to punish him. The ex-Prefect was cruelly tortured, but supernaturally healed. His arguments and constancy touched the heart of Hermogenes, and both Augustals, to the astonishment of the Pagans, did all in their power for the increase of the Church. Maximin himself visited Alexandria, and condemned both the Confessors to death; and at this time it probably was that S. Catherine² suffered.

of S. Mennas
and S. Her-
mogenes:

In Cyrene, the Bishop Theodore³ was among the Confessors,

¹ Menolog. Dec. 10, Baronius, 307, xxxiv.—xxxvii. In the Ethiopic Calendar, on the same day, we have Menas; but then he is joined with Simeon Behor, of whom the Coptic Calendar says, that he was a Monk who suffered Martyrdom under the Mussulmans. But on the 4th of Oct., we have **ሚናስ ወልሳና**: Menas and Hasina: which last name may be a gross corruption of Hermogenes.

² Eusebius, H. E. viii. 14, mentions, among those who had resisted the unholy solicitations of the tyrant Maximin, a lady of Alexandria, remarkable for beauty, wealth, and talent. The emperor used every possible means to bend her to his will; but on her constant refusal, his passion for her would not allow him to take her life. Rufinus adds, that she had consecrated herself to God, and that her name was Dorothea. Baronius (307, xxxi.) thinks that this may have been the celebrated S. Catherine, more properly Hecaterina, which name, as derived from Hecate, she might have been induced to change. Pagi (307, xvi.)

denies the possibility of this, because the constant tradition of the Church is, that S. Catherine suffered Martyrdom: whereas Eusebius expressly affirms that the lady of whom he writes, was only condemned to banishment. With him agrees Bollandus (February 6), and Tillemont v. 3, 101. The present fame of S. Catherine, as compared with the total ignorance that prevailed, for many centuries, of her name, is remarkable. Till the tenth century, no mention is made of her by the Oriental Church: in that age, we are told, one Paul, a hermit, celebrated her festival with great devotion. The Crusades introduced the fame of S. Catherine into the West. She is not mentioned in the Ethiopic Calendar.

³ The Roman Martyrology, on the 26th of March, celebrates S. Theodore, Bishop of Ptolemais, and on the 4th of July, S. Theodore, Bishop of Cyrene. These, as Le Quien (ii. 621) observes, seem to be one and the same person. There was another Martyr Theodore, a soldier, under Licinius, named by Eutychius (i. 427), and celebrated in the Ethiopic

with a Deacon Irenæus, and two Readers, Serapion and Ammonius. The Prelate survived. But none was more illustrious than S. Cyrilla, in the same city. When the burning coals with the incense were forced into her hand, she held it motionless, lest, if she shook them off, she should seem to have sacrificed: after this she was grievously tortured, and so entered into Paradise.

S. Peter's life was spared to his Church as long as it stood in need of his care and protection. Like another Moses, he was permitted to see the good land into which the LORD was about to bring His people, though he himself might not enter thence. He heard of the cessation of the persecution in the West, and in Palestine; he received tidings of the edict for liberty of Christian worship that the dying agonies of Galerius wrung from him, and then he was called to follow his companions, and to close the long train of Martyrs for CHRIST. In his company suffered Faustus,¹ whom we have already mentioned as signalising himself under S. Dionysius,² Dios, and Ammonius.

It is remarkable, considering the high place which he held in the Church, as well from his office as his sanctity, that no authentic acts of his Confession have been preserved. The Arabic historian, Severus, gives an account, which, though mixed up with some fables, probably contains a good deal of truth, and may, therefore, be worth while relating.

There was, he says, at Antioch, a Christian of some dignity, named Socrates, who in time of persecution fell away. His wife remained faithful, and requested her husband's leave to take his two sons to Alexandria, for the purpose of being baptized there. He refused, fearing the emperor's wrath; on which she made her escape with them, and commending herself to God, embarked for Egypt. A storm arose, and the sailors gave themselves up for lost. The mother, unwilling that her children should perish unbaptized, herself performed the rite, in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. The tempest passed over, and the ship arrived safely

and Coptic Calendars, on the 20th of July, and who is to be distinguished from him who is known as Theodorus Tiro, and celebrated by S. Gregory Nyssen.

¹ Euseb. H. E., viii. 13.

² Ante p. 67: and, of course to be distinguished from him who is mentioned at p. 47 and p. 80.

at Alexandria; and, as it happened, at the very time that the Easter Baptisms were about to be performed. Presenting herself to a Deacon of the Church, she informed him of the motive which had brought her into Egypt; but said nothing of the occurrence which had taken place on the voyage. The Deacon laid the matter before the Bishop, who promised to baptize the children among the other candidates. When their time came, he was twice miraculously impeded: and calling the mother, he inquired what she had done. On hearing her tale, he bade her be of good cheer: God, he said, had already received her children; and the One Baptism could not be repeated. Returning to Antioch, the mother and her infants were burnt alive, by order of the emperor; and stricter inquiry commanded to be made for S. Peter.¹

When it was known, this writer proceeds to tell us,² that S. Peter's life would fall a sacrifice to the emperor's indignation, Arius, who had all this time remained excommunicate, requested several of those with whom he was acquainted, as well clergy as laity, to intercede for him with the Bishop. They did so; and when they hoped that he was about to comply with his request, he said with a loud voice, "Let Arius be anathema from our LORD JESUS CHRIST, in this world, and in the world to come." Struck with the vehemence with which these words were pronounced, none dared to plead in favour of the guilty man; and S. Peter rising, and taking two of his disciples, Achilles and Alexander, apart, informed them, that the anathema he had pronounced was not the effect of any private resentment: that, on the preceding night, he had beheld in a vision our SAVIOUR with a garment rent from top to bottom; that on inquiring, "who, LORD, hath thus rent Thy garment?" he received for answer, "Arius": that he knew therefore, that Arius would bring some great evil on the Church. He further informed

and of the
anathema
pronounced
on Arius.

¹ The principal argument against this tale is, that it is not mentioned by any Oriental writer on the Discipline of the Church: though almost all of them, as is well known, regard Baptism administered by a woman to be absolutely null. Renaudot, how-

ever, (p. 57,) does not seem inclined entirely to reject it. Severus is inaccurate, at all events, because he speaks of Diocletian as still emperor.

² See also the Acts in Surius, Nov. 25.

them that they should, in turn, be his successors: he exhorted them to oppose to the utmost whatever heresies might, whether by Arius or others, be propagated, to shew themselves valiant and vigilant for God, after the example of his predecessor, Dionysius, of blessed memory, and his zeal against the Sabelians. He then bade them farewell, assuring them that they should see his face no more: and turning to the rest of his flock, he confirmed them in the Faith, prayed over them, and gave them his benediction.¹

When he was committed to prison, the Christians collected in great numbers, determined to oppose the execution of the Imperial Edict, and prevented the soldiers from entering by the door. It was a stormy and rainy night: and the centurion took advantage of the noise of the elements, to throw down that part of the wall which bounded the cell of S. Peter. When an orifice had been made in it for this purpose, the Prelate, fearing that the design would be observed, and the Christians endeavour to oppose it, made the sign of the Cross, and said, "Better is it that we should die, than that such a multitude should meet with evil for my sake." And with these words, boldly stretching forth his head to the soldiers, it was struck from the body. At the same time, a voice was heard by a consecrated virgin proclaiming, "As Peter was the first of the Apostles, so shall Peter be the last of the Martyrs."²

Such are the Arabic traditions of the Martyrdom of S. Peter. Eusebius simply relates, that he was unexpectedly arrested and beheaded. He is named by the Greeks the Seal and End of the Martyrs; an epithet which is not literally true. For, even in Alexandria, SS. Cyrus and John suffered two months subsequently.

Besides the Canons on Penitence, and the fragment of a Paschal Epistle preserved at their end, S. Peter composed a work

Martyrdom
of S. Peter.

¹ Pagi (310. iv.) rejects the vision of S. Peter, simply on the ground that the Acts *varias suppositionis et falsitatis notas præferunt*. This is very true: but is surely no argument against their also containing much

that is true. The story is also related by Eutychius. (i. 426, 7.)

² Makrizi says, (§ 102), that his wife and two sons were slain with him, which is a mere fable.

on the Divinity of the SAVIOUR, and another on His Coming. In the latter he confuted the opinion of Origen on the pre-existence of souls.¹

SECTION XIV.

S. ANTONY AND THE RISE OF MONASTICISM.

S. Antony, WHILE the Church of Alexandria was destitute of a Pastor, it pleased GOD to raise her up a protector, in one whom we have not yet had occasion to mention, but whose actions had already excited great notice, and whose influence was beginning to be felt in every part of Egypt. We speak of S. Antony, the Father of Monastic Life.

though preceded by the Therapeutæ,

We have already dwelt on the mystical temperament of the Alexandrian Church. The natural result may be traced in the adoption of the eremitical life by the holiest of her sons; and the case appears to have been so from the earliest age. Even under S. Mark, the Therapeutæ had already distinguished their holiness and devotion,—and S. Frontonius,² in the middle of the second century, had, with seventy brethren, led the life of a recluse, in the same mountain tract which they had hallowed. S. Paul had long since betaken himself into the wilderness: and was still leading there his life of more than human asceticism. At or near Antinous,³ SS. Julian and Basilissa, observing continence in the married state, had formed a double kind of hospital for men and women; and there, when the latter had departed to her rest, the former

S. Frontonius,

S. Paul,

SS. Julian and Basilissa,

¹ In the larger part of the Western Church S. Peter is now commemorated on the 26th of November,—because S. Catherine is honoured on the 25th: in the Oriental Church, generally speaking, on the 24th: by the Russian and Ethiopic Churches on the 25th. As the mere enumeration of the names of those Martyrs who are known to have suffered in Egypt, in the persecution of Diocletian, would have interrupted the course of our history, we have inserted them in Appendix A.

² Bollandus, April 14. See also Bellarmine de Monachis, ii. 5.

³ See their Acts under Jan. 9, of Bollandus. There can be little doubt, that they lived at Antinous, and not at Antioch: and there seems to have been no such place as 'Antioch in Egypt,' which some of the MSS. mention. It appears certain that the numbers of those that followed their example are, by the same Acts, overstated.

received a glorious Martyrdom, in company with several associates, under Maximin.¹ And separated by the Red Sea from Egypt, the still illustrious monastery of Mount Sinai even then existed: for forty of its inmates had suffered under Diocletian, and their house had been temporarily destroyed. It thus appears that there were, at the time when S. Antony commenced his career, a few holy anchorets scattered throughout Egypt: but their number was small, their system undefined, their devotions unconnected, and it was not till the rise of Antony, that the deserts of Thebais and of Egypt became the favourite retreat and the principal school of monks and anchorets.

the real
Father of
Monastic
life.

Antony was born at Coma,¹ a village near Heracleopolis, and on the boundary of Upper Egypt, about the year 251. Educated at home,² by Christian parents of noble birth, and considerable property, he was so completely cut off from the knowledge of the world, that he was acquainted with no one out of his own family: nor did he ever learn to read any other language than his native Egyptian. Christianity, during his youth, must have been protected or connived at: for we read that he was in the habit of attending with his parents the church, while at home he was a pattern of obedience and submission. When he had attained the age of twenty, he was left an orphan, with a younger sister in his charge; and for some time he continued the same course of life to which he had been accustomed, and occupied himself with her education, and with the management of his estate. At the end of six months, however, while engaged in meditating on the readiness with which the Holy Apostles abandoned all things for the sake of CHRIST, he was struck, by hearing in the church the words of our LORD, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow Me." At once he resolved

His birth
A. D. 250.*

and educa-
tion.

¹ It is not absolutely certain that Coma was anything more than a corruption of *κώμη*, antonomastically used out of honour to S. Antony. So Ortelius, in his *Thesaurus Geographicus*, thinks. Bolland. § i. 5. But afterwards it was undoubtedly used as a proper name. Sozomen (i. 13) says, *ἐγένετο δὲ οὗτος Αἰγύπτιος ἀπὸ Κωμῆ*.

And Nicephorus, (viii. 4.) *ἀπὸ κώμης οὕτω λεγομένης Κωμῆ*. S. Athanasius does not mention the name of the place.

² S. Athanasius, in *Vit. S. Anton.* i. 39.

* Or A.D. 251, as others will have it. Ceillier, *Hist. Gen.* iv. 501.

He sells his
goods,

to follow the Evangelical Counsel: and parting with all his estates, which contained three hundred aruræ,¹ and were noted for their fertility, he distributed them among his neighbours; that there might be no dispute between them as to right of possession. His other property he turned into money, and apportioned to the poor, retaining a small portion for the future wants of his sister. But, going a second time to the church, he listened to the words, "Take therefore no thought for the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself": and on his return home, he distributed the remainder of his property to the poor, and placed his sister in a kind of religious house for women, perhaps one of those which had arisen in imitation of the Christian love of Basilissa. There she prolonged her life to a good old age: and in her turn, became the Mother and the Directress of many Virgins.

and em-
braces the
solitary life:
Circ. A. D.
271.

Having thus divested himself of all earthly cares, he resolved on embracing a solitary life. In its perfection it was yet entirely unknown: those who had adopted it dwelt in a retired spot near some village, whence they might be supplied with the necessaries of life. Such an hermit there was near Coma, and from him Antony derived his first instructions in the ascetic life. He made choice of a suitable retreat: and from thence visited the different anchorets in the neighbourhood: selecting with a holy eclecticism the various points in the practice of each, which it was his desire to form into one perfect whole. In the mean time he wrought with his own hands, and after supplying himself with bread from the profit of his labour, distributed the rest among the poor.

Even while he dwelt in his first cell, he was exposed to those temptations of Satan, which have rendered his history a mark of scorn for the sceptic, of pity for the liberal, and of astonishment to him who believes in the wiles of an ever-present Enemy, and in the unseen might of an ever-victorious Church. He that

¹ From Strabo we learn that the Egyptian *nomes* were subdivided into *toparchiæ*, and these again into *ἄρoura*: and that the latter were the smallest division of land, and contained each a hundred square cubits. He adds, that a minute and well ascertained division

was very necessary on account of the inundation of the Nile, which obliterated landmarks, and altered the very shapes of fields. This may serve to explain S. Antony's fear of disputes with his neighbours as to property.

doubts the temptations of S. Antony, must doubt every supernatural occurrence: must set at nought the testimony of witnesses never so numerous, of holiness never so manifest, of historians never so judicious, of influence never so prevailing. We are not about to relate, far less to defend, these narrations. But none can doubt thus much: that a life, as completely contrary to every natural desire of the heart as was that of the Egyptian hermits, such a total abnegation of every tie between the individual and the world, such constant danger, want, and suffering, days and nights so lonely,—and all this endured without the hope of human applause, because beyond the sphere of human knowledge;—that such a life, we say, which is believed by all to have been practised, is far more wonderful, and far more contrary to antecedent experience, than the marvellous tale of the conflicts of S. Antony.

For some time he dwelt in a monument,¹ situated at a considerable distance from his native village. At the age of thirty-five, he resolved on a more secluded retreat. He would fain have had the aged hermit, from whom he had learnt his first lessons in asceticism, for his companion; but the faith of the old man shrank from an ordeal so terrible in itself, and hitherto so wholly unattempted. On this, Antony crossed the river, penetrated, by himself, the wilder parts of the desert; and took up his abode in a deserted castle among the mountains. He closed its doors, and could not be persuaded to re-open them for twenty years. Bread was brought him half-yearly; and he quenched his thirst in a spring that arose within the building. His fasts were most rigorous; or rather his whole life was one continual fast. He never tasted food till after sun-set; and frequently prolonged his abstinence for three consecutive days. His fame attracted numerous visitors from various parts of Egypt: he spoke to them from his prison, but would not permit them to see his face. Frequently his visitors were terrified by the supernatural and terrific sounds which issued from his castle: but the Saint bade them be of good cheer, and scorn the efforts of those who had been conquered on the Cross.

It was now the middle of the tenth persecution, when Antony, overcome by the solicitations of his friends,² who were desirous

his temptations.

S. Antony in the Castle: A. D. 285.

he begins to receive disciples: A. D. 305.

¹ S. Athanas. Vit. S. Ant. § 16.

² S. Athanas., § 24.

that he should form a monastic institute, came out of his castle. They were astonished to find the same figure, the same countenance, that they remembered him to have possessed. His fasts and his confinement seemed equally to have been unable to affect him. The miracles that he then performed, as they must much have cheered the faith of the Church under her heavy trial, so they induced many of her children to place themselves under the guidance of the great Hermit.

Locality of
his Monas-
tery.

Between the Red Sea and the Nile,¹ and nearly opposite to Mount Sinai, the desert is intersected by two ranges of mountains which, running north and south, stretch themselves interruptedly for many leagues. That to the east is now called Zaffarana: that to the west is known by the name Khalili. More northerly, and nearly opposite the ancient Heracleopolis, the mountains run east and west; looking down from their northern side, on the pilgrim's road from Cairo to Suez. The whole of this region was soon tenanted by holy anchorets;—S. Antony himself founded his first, and more illustrious monastery, towards its northern extremity.

It lay nearly equidistant from the cities of Memphis,² Babylon, (now Cairo,) and Aphroditopolis (now Atfieh). On an abrupt stony mountain, situated at about thirty miles' distance from the Nile, and only to be surmounted by the laborious zigzags of a winding pass, it received its name from the little town of Troy, which lay somewhat to the south of Babylon. At the summit of this mountain, repeatedly termed by S. Athanasius the *interior*, were two small cells, hewn out of the rock, and here it was that Antony himself principally dwelt: his monastery was situated on the opposite, or *exterior* mountain, known also by the name of Pisper. These savage crags, the barrenness and desolation of the interjacent plains, the melancholy sound of the torrents, falling from rock to rock, till finally lost in the bibulous sand, seem to have impressed those who then visited the

¹ Bollandus devotes § 2 to the description of the locality of S. Antony's cell and monastery. Of course, he labours under the disadvantage of inability to avail himself of the accounts of later travellers.

² Comp. Palladius, § 25. S. Hieron. Vit. S. Hilarion. S. Athanas. Vit. S. Anton. 78, 79. See Pococke, i. 128; Granger, Relation d'une Voyage, &c. 107.

spot, as they do modern travellers, with the deepest awe. Soon the adjacent mountains were too narrow a domain for his fervent band of disciples: and, crossing the Nile, they began to fill the deserts in the neighbourhood of Arsinoë.

Of his followers, many are still held in honour by the Church. Among these, the two Macarii hold the first place. The Elder,¹ or Egyptian, was not strictly speaking, a disciple, though he afterwards became the friend of Antony. The place of his retreat was the savage wilderness of Scete, eighty miles beyond Mount Nitria, and rather in Libya than in Egypt. Here he dwelt sixty years, and became the spiritual father of many anchorets, who peopled that desert. He was compelled by an Egyptian Prelate to receive holy orders, and saw four churches rise in the very heart of the desert where he had withdrawn himself. The younger, or Alexandrine, Macarius,² originally a seller of sweetmeats, who was also elevated to the Priestly Office, had even a wider reputation than his namesake.³ He had a dwelling in Mount Nitria, another in the Desert, as it was afterwards called, of Cells, from the multitude of hermits that there had their abodes; and a third in that of Scete. In his power of abstinence and self-discipline, he was unrivalled even by Antony himself. There was yet a third⁴ hermit of the same name, who was placed by S. Antony in charge of his monastery of Pisper: and who succeeded him in the government of his five thousand monks. Of no less renown was S. Pachomius, the first that committed a monastic rule to writing. S. Isidore was another of the anchorets of renown. He also was a priest in the desert of Scete: and was reckoned one of the Fathers of that wilderness. The like reputation was also acquired by S. Pambo, who, above all others, was noted for his diligence in manual labour. Among the personal friends of Antony, were Sarmata, who was honoured by martyrdom in an irruption of barbarians, and Amathas, who ministered to the death-bed of the departing Patriarch of monks. And the great S. Hilarion, a native of the neighbour-

His disciples:

¹ Sozomen, iii. 13. Socrates, iv. 18. Bollandus, Jan. 15.

² Palladius de Vit. Pat. 8, 19. Bollandus, Jan. 2.

³ Palladius says, *Secundus autem ætate, sed in eis quæ sunt monacho-*

rum præcipua, primas partes obtinens, . . . erat Alexandrinus.

⁴ See this point argued by Bollandus, in S. Macarius the Elder, Jan. 15. § i. 4.

hood of Gaza, was to be the first propagator of Egyptian Monasticism in his native land.

But at the time of which we yet write, these illustrious servants of God were some in childhood, some in training for their conflicts and victories. We will leave them in their deserts, to fight, by their prayers, and tears, and fasts, the great battle of the Alexandrian Church, on the relation of which we shall soon enter. When they have passed long years of hardness and mortification, we shall return to them again, and endeavour to sketch that life which as yet was but in course of formation.

he visits
Alexandria,
A. D. 311.

At the re-commencement of the persecution by Maximin, S. Antony, exclaiming to those about him, "Let us go to combat ourselves, or to see the combatants,"¹ left his mountain, and hastened to Alexandria, where he arrived just before the death of S. Peter. Anxious as he was for martyrdom, he would not expose himself to the tribunal, but he ministered to the Confessors in the mines and in prisons: he went with the accused before the judge, and he accompanied the condemned to the place of execution. Several of his companions imitated his example: and the Prefect, astonished at their boldness, issued an edict, by which it was forbidden to any monk to present himself in the hall of judgment, or to sojourn in the city. The disciples feared, and hid themselves; the Master, clad in his white robe, took up his position in a conspicuous spot, and crossed the path of the Prefect as he passed with his train. Deeply grieving that he had not been honoured with the Martyr's Crown, and perceiving that the violence of the persecution was passed, he returned to the mountain.

Martyrdom
of SS. Cyrus,
John, and
their com-
panions,
A. D. 312.

The last who fell under Maximin, for the faith of CHRIST, were the holy Martyrs Cyrus, John, and their companions.² Cyrus was a physician of Alexandria, who had improved the

¹ S. Athanas., Vit. S. Anton. 60.

² See their Acts, by an uncertain Greek author, in Bollandus, Jan. 31. We follow Tillemont in fixing A. D. 312, as the date of their Martyrdom. It is true that most of the Martyrologies make them to have suffered under Diocletian: but it is very possible, that by his persecution, is simply

meant that which he began. The Ethiopic Calendar gives አቡዮር : ወዮሐንስ ፤ አሞኒ : ወአጎናስያ : Abukir and John, Amogi and Athanasia. Abukir is, of course, Abu-Cyrus; but we cannot comprehend to whom or to what Amogi refers.

opportunities afforded by his profession to convert many of his patients: under Diocletian he had, in obedience to the LORD's commandment, fled into Arabia, and had there become acquainted with John, an officer of rank, who accompanied him back to Alexandria, and became his guest. Hearing that Athanasia, a Christian lady, had been arrested at Canopus, in company with her three daughters, Theodosia, Theoctiste, and Eudoxia, the eldest of whom was only fifteen years of age, the two friends hastened thither, in order to console the Confessors. And they obtained a signal reward for their charity; for, being themselves apprehended, and tortured in the most cruel manner, torches being applied to their sides, and vinegar and salt poured into their wounds, they witnessed a good confession, in which S. Athanasia and her daughters followed them. The latter were first beheaded: two days after, Cyrus and John in the same manner put on immortality; and by their deaths closed the persecution.

SECTION XV.

THE ARIAN HERESY.

AFTER a vacancy of about a year,¹ and doubtless, as soon as prudence would allow, Achillas was raised to the Evangelical Throne. We have already mentioned that he was a disciple of S. Peter the Martyr²: he had been ordained by Theonas, at the same time with Pierius. It would appear that the friends of

S. Achillas,
Patr. XVIII.,
A.D. 312:
A.M. 28.

¹ There is much difficulty as to the length of the vacancy, and the time that Achillas, or Archillas, as the Coptic Indices call him, filled the Chair. The Chronicon of Eusebius gives ten or six years (for both numbers are read), to his Episcopate. Theodoret says, *ὀλίγον χρόνον προέστη*. Makrizi (who calls the Patriarch Archelaus) allots (§ 103) six months to him, as does Severus, and the Chronicon Orientale. Euty-chius (p. 407), six months. Pococke carelessly translates, years. S. Epi-

phanus, (Hær. 69), three months: but, with his usual incorrectness as to dates, that Father makes him successor to S. Alexander. Gelasius (Act. Synod. Nic. ii. 1.) gives him five months. From Pagi and Solle-rius, it would appear most probable that Achillas was consecrated after,—and probably, some little time after,—July 25, 312, (*i. e.* in the seventh year of Constantine), and that he died June 13, 313. Sollerius, p. 44.

² Euseb. H. E. vii. 32.

Arius importuned him to remove the anathema pronounced by his predecessor¹: and he not only did this, but elevated the future heresiarch to the Priesthood, and appointed him to the church of Baucalis, already named as the oldest in the city. The Jacobite writers will have it, that the death of the Prelate, which followed shortly after, was a supernatural punishment for having violated the last injunction of S. Peter; and they therefore exclude him from a place in their Calendar. If, however, Achillas erred, it was through ignorance: otherwise S. Athanasius would hardly have commended him under the title of the *great*. Achillas only sat seven months.

Sketch of
the history
of the
successors
of
Diocletian.

We will now for a moment cast our eyes on the state of the Church Catholic.

Diocletian and Maximian, compelled to resign the purple by the superior vigour and enterprise of Galerius, named, as we have already seen, their successors; Galerius himself was nominated as the Eastern, Constantius as the Western Augustus: the Cæsars were respectively Daïa, nephew to Galerius, and surnamed by him Maximin, and Severus. On this the persecution languished, and finally failed in the West; and on the death of Constantius, his son Constantine, elevated to the purple by the soldiers, but contenting himself, for the present, with the more modest title of Cæsar, was known to be most favourably disposed to the Faith of CHRIST. Maxentius, however, at Rome, declared himself Emperor; and, to prejudice the army in his favour, associated his father Maximian with himself. Severus, now Augustus in the West, marched against them; his troops forsook him: he fled to Ravenna, surrendered himself, and was put to death. On this, Maximian associated Constantine with him in the Empire: Galerius marched into Italy, but was forced to retire with dishonour: Licinius was presented by him with the purple, and a hollow reconciliation took place between the six Emperors, Galerius, Maximian, Maximin, Licinius, Constantine, Maxentius. Maximian endeavouring to destroy Constantine by treachery, was discovered and capitally punished; and the five surviving emperors were acknowledged equals. Galerius, eaten of worms, gave up the ghost, after having issued an edict in favour of the Christians, which was only nominally obeyed by Maximin, and

¹ Chron. Orient.—Eutychius, (p. 407.)

the persecution ceased every where but in Syria and Egypt. Then followed the civil war between Constantine and Maxentius : the apparition of the miraculous Cross ; the defeat and death of Maxentius ; Maximin, burning to revenge his loss, was defeated by Licinius, and perished miserably : the Great Tenth Persecution came to an entire end : and to the joy of the Church, Constantine and Licinius were recognised as joint Augusti.

But the persecution, though no longer formidable, had not entirely ceased at Alexandria, when S. Achillas was called from his labours. Two candidates appeared for the vacant Chair : the one was Arius ; the other Alexander, the friend of Achillas, the disciple of Peter, and a man generally beloved for the sweetness and gentleness of his disposition. The latter was elected by unanimous consent of clergy and people : and Arius,¹ who could not endure this preference of his rival, determined to find some pretext for separating himself from his communion.

S. Alexander:
Patr. XIX.
A.D. 313.*
A.M. 29.

The Meletians, who had not refrained from calumniating Achillas,² continued their accusations against Alexander ; and they even went so far as to lay a formal complaint against him before the Emperor³ : whether Licinius or Constantine be meant it is impossible to decide. It would appear also that Alexandria was troubled by a faction, headed by one Crescentius, who was schismatical on the proper time of observing Easter ; and that Alexander was obliged to compose a treatise on the received practice.⁴

harassed by
the
Meletians:

As the life of Alexander was perfectly irreproachable, Arius was reduced to calumniate his doctrine. An occasion soon presented itself. The Prelate, in one of his sermons, maintained the Unity of the Trinity ; and this statement was branded by Arius with the title of Sabellianism. If the FATHER, he argued, has begotten a SON, there must be a period at which the SON was begotten ; and consequently there must

accused by
Arius of Sa-
bellianism.

¹ Theodoret, i. 2.

² S. Athanas. cont. Arian. Or. 1.

³ Ibid. S. Epiphanius is strangely misled by his Meletian memoirs, when he makes Meletius not only to have lived on terms of intimacy with S. Alexander, but to have been the first to bring before him the true principles of Arius.

⁴ S. Epiphanius. Hær. 70. Tillemont, vi. 1. 365.

* This date will necessarily follow from what we have said above, on the accession of S. Achillas ; so that it is needless to refute the Chronicon of S. Jerome, which places the commencement of his Patriarchate in 320 or 321.

be a period when He had no being. Hence it followed, that the SON of GOD was created by the FATHER; and Arius attributed to Him the power of either holiness or sin, maintaining that by His Free Will He chose the former, being equally capable, had He so chosen, of the latter.¹ The heretic did not at first dare to preach this doctrine; it would have been heard with undisguised horror. But in private conversations he seized every opportunity of insinuating it; and being respected for his sobriety and gravity, endued with great powers of persuasion, and in the decline of life, he soon found himself followed with eagerness, and heard with attention. Thus it happened, that many were already seduced to heresy before S. Alexander was aware of the danger. In the meanwhile, the different parish priests of Alexandria,—for Alexandria, as we had occasion to observe in the introduction, was, like Rome, divided into parish churches or *tithes*, to which the different Presbyters were attached,—maintained different doctrines, and the faithful were distracted, divided, and perplexed by the voices of their teachers. The trumpet gave an uncertain sound; and who could prepare himself for the battle? It would appear that, at this time, the church of Baucalis, as it was the oldest, so also was it the most honourable cure; it was in the heart of the mercantile part of the city, and Arius thence acquired greater influence. He was supported, among the parish priests,² by Carponas, and Sarmates, by Aithalas, Achilles, and his own namesake Arius; among the deacons, by Euzoius, Macarius, Julius, Menas, and Helladius. Alexander, seems, at the outset, to have hesitated as to his proper course; and a momentary appearance of irresolution encouraged the discord. The Arians exclaimed against him as a Sabellian; some of the Catholics called him an Arian, because, in their judgment, he did not shew sufficient vigour in putting down the new sect; and Coluthus,³ one of the parish priests, separated himself from the communion of his Bishop, and even ventured (not, it is hinted,⁴ without simony,) to ordain Presby-

Rise of the
Arian
heresy:
A.D. 319 :*

and of the
schism of
Coluthus.

¹ Socrates, H. E., i. 5. Sozomen, i. 15.

² Sozomen, i. 15.

³ In spelling this name with one l, we follow the rule given by Valesius, in writing on the word Coluthion in

Euseb. H. E. vii. 11. S. Gregory Nyssen (Lib. xi. cont. Eunom.) calls the schismatic Acoluthus.

⁴ Theodoret, i. 4, and Valesius, note 5.

* Le Quien, ii. Index, p. xiv. Tillemont, vi. 3, 774.

ters, pretending that the necessities of the times justified him in this action. As schism is seldom unaccompanied by false doctrine, he further taught that God is not the Author of evil, which proposition, though capable of a Catholic sense, is heretical in that which Coluthus attached to it: namely, that God does not produce those evils which, as punishments, afflict men.¹ The Coluthians were never a powerful sect; and in the end, by no uncommon change, the greater part of the followers,—for the leader himself, as we shall see, recanted his errors,²—allied themselves with the Arians.³

At length the evil rose to such a height, that Alexander was compelled to take some decisive step for its termination. He summoned a meeting of the clergy of Alexandria, and allowed to all a full liberty of explaining and defending their sentiments. Willing rather to persuade by reason, than to force by authority, he refrained at first from giving his own judgment⁴: and the conference closed without any result, both parties claiming the victory. A second assembly, held with the same intention, equally failed of attaining its end. It was probably in one of these two meetings that Arius presented to his Bishop a confession of Faith,⁵ very simple in its expressions, and bearing on its face a Catholic sense: but so contrived as to be capable of perversion to the heretic's own meaning: and which was therefore rejected as unsatisfactory.

Conference
at Alexan-
dria.

The heresy every day increasing, Alexander, after a solemn warning to Arius to renounce his errors, and to return to the Doctrine of the Apostles, found that his only resource lay in excommunication. Assembling then the principal Priests of Alexandria, and of the neighbouring province of Marcotis, he

Synod of
Alexandria:
A.D. 320.

¹ S. August. Lib. de Hæres. § lxxv. It is necessary, however, to make the proviso in the text; otherwise we run into the opposite error of the Florinians. S. Augustine, in § lxxvi. of the same tract, thus draws the distinction; "God creates evil, by bringing just punishments on man, which Coluthus saw not; but not by creating evil natures and substances, so far forth as they are so: and in this lay the error of Florinus."

² S. Athanas. Apol. cont. Arian. § 80. (i. 155, E. F.).

³ Sozomen, i. 15 (p. 32, 5, Ed. Reading:—which we always quote). If this writer means anything further by his expression, *πέπονθέ τι καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ταπρῶτα, πῇ μὲν τούτους, πῇ δὲ ἐκείνους ἐπαινῶν*, he contradicts all other historians, and most of all Socrates, who hints, (but with little probability,) that Alexander, from a personal dislike to Arius, acted too precipitately against him.

⁴ S. Basil. in Eunomium, lib. i. 4. i, 289 (Ed. Paris. 1839).—Tillemont, vi. 1, 368.

Arius con-
demned :

proposed that sentence accordingly. The partizans of Arius made a show of defence : but their efforts were unavailing. Five Priests and five Deacons only attached themselves to his faction ; thirty-six Priests, and forty-four Deacons signed the sentence against him.¹ Among the former, Coluthus signs first : but this must have been a different person from the author of the schism.² Among the latter, the signatures occur of two that bear the name of Athanasius.

Commence-
ment of S.
Athanasius :

One of these was already in the confidence of Alexander, and had given promise of the highest talent. He was known by a treatise against the Gentiles : in which, though the writer had not much exceeded the twentieth year of his age,³ he displayed such power of argument, such acquaintance with Scripture, such deep learning, united with so much wit, and such elegance of expression, that great things were expected from him. Born about the year 296, his tender youth had exempted him from the fury of the Tenth Persecution ; but doubtless, in the Martyrdoms that he must himself have witnessed, and in the many more which must have formed the daily topic of conversation, his mind was led to that energetic sense of His full and proper Divinity, Who was the strength of the Martyrs, that, in after times, wrought such wonders for the Church. He was thoroughly educated in profane as well as in Christian antiquity :

¹ It is a question, whether the signatures of thirty-three Priests and twenty-nine Deacons, given by Gelasius in his History of the Council of Nicæa, cap. iii. (Labbe, Concil. ii. 148) refer to this sentence or not. Gelasius himself appends them to that encyclic letter of Alexander, which is quoted by Socrates (i. 3). Tillemont (vi. 1, 474, note ii.) examines this question very unsatisfactorily. It would seem on the whole, that Gelasius was inaccurate in this matter.

² The Benedictine Editors will have it that it was the same ; and therefore are compelled to put the schism a year or two later (B. E. Vit. S. Athanas. 322, 1.)

³ It is morally certain that at the time this work was written, the Arian heresy had not broken out :—otherwise, towards its conclusion, the writer

could hardly have failed, from the very nature of his subject, to touch on its doctrines. But that S. Athanasius was born about A.D. 296, is plain from these considerations. He tells us himself (Hist. ad Monach. 64), that he had heard from his elders of certain events connected with the persecution of Maximian,—events, that is, which happened in A.D. 303 or 4. Now, had Athanasius been more than seven or eight years old, he never would have spoken of hearing of these things, when he must have remembered them. Again, he says (de Incarn. 56) that he learnt the doctrine he there lays down from the Martyrs : that is, before the end of A.D. 311. We cannot imagine him to have done so before the age of fifteen (B. E. vi. 296, 1).

and Homer and Plato seem to have been, in an especial manner, his admiration and study. In short, it might be said of him, as it was of another, that he "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds."

Arius, on his condemnation by the Synod of Alexandria, far from owning himself in the wrong, was but the more eager to strengthen his party, and to procure, by fair means or foul, a reversal of his sentence. Finding that his partizans were outnumbered in the metropolis, he excited, by letters and by friends, the other portions of Egypt. In Marcotis, especially, he was successful; and in Libya, his native country, Secundus, Bishop of Ptolemais,¹ Theonas of Marmarica, (the latter of whom is said to have been consecrated by the Meletians,)² Secundus of Teuchiri, and Zephyrius of Barce, pledged themselves to the new heresy. Among the laity of Alexandria, great progress was made by the insinuating manners and plausible language of Arius; and among the consecrated virgins he drew away great numbers. Alexander found that the struggle, far from being terminated by the decision of his first synod, grew daily more formidable: and threatened the very foundations of his Church.

He therefore convoked a general Council of his province: and we now, for the first time, learn the number of Prelates over whom the Patriarch of Alexandria presided: the synod was attended by nearly one hundred³: and it would appear that very few could have been absent. Arius and his friends prepared themselves to the utmost of their ability for their trial; but notwithstanding the equivocal manner in which they stated their dogmas, and their ingenuity in so couching their sentences as to be patient of a Catholic sense, they excited the horror of the synod. They stated, to use S. Alexander's own words, that God was not always a Father: but that there was a period in which He was not so; that God, Who is, created Him That was not from that which is not; wherefore there was a time when the Son was not, because He is a creature and a thing made; that He is not similar to the FATHER in substance, nor His True and genuine Word and Wisdom;—but when called

the Arians
rapidly
increase:

Council of
Alexandria
A.D. 321.

Arius states
his dogmas,

¹ Ep. S. Alexandri ap. Socr. II. E. i. 6 (p. 11, 20).

² So S. Epiphanius (Hær. 69,) says :
—*ἦν δὲ καὶ Θεωνῆς κατασταθεὶς ὑπὸ*

τῶν Μελιτιανῶν—and he may be the more easily credited on any point that reflects discredit on these schismatics.

³ Ep. S. Alex. ap. Socr. (p. 12, 18)

so, is named so in an improper and lax signification, as having His origin from the proper Word of God, and the Wisdom that is in Him, by which He made all things, and among them the Sox,—for the heretics thus distinguished a twofold Word, and a twofold Wisdom.¹ One of the Prelates, whose zeal for the truth led him to put the matter in its clearest and simplest light, inquired, whether in the opinion of Arius, the Sox of God could change, as Satan had changed²? And the heretic unblushingly replied, He can, because He is by nature not immutable. The Prelates, on hearing this and other dogmas, came to an unanimous conclusion, and declaring Arius and his followers separate from the Communion of the Catholic Church, delivered them over to an anathema, till such time as they should repent and recant.

Arius is anathematized :

Among all the losses that Ecclesiastical History has sustained, none is more to be regretted than the loss of a complete Arian account of these events, such as that of Philostorgius. Till we have it,—though it is not probable that such a work now exists,—we shall never be able to explain that wonderful mystery, the early progress of Arianism. A Priest at Alexandria,—and that, too, a man branded as the follower of a convicted schismatic,—proclaims a novel doctrine : two synods are convoked against it and condemn it ; and yet within six years, it convulses the whole Church from Britain to India ; and compels an Emperor to interfere in the restoration of peace. It is not wonderful that Catholic writers, more especially such as were engaged in the struggle, should have been so pre-occupied with their sense of the blasphemy of the new system, that they had no eyes for its plausibility. Thus, Alexander mentions with horror the dogma of Arius,—“There was a time when the Son was not, as being a creature and a thing made.” Doubtless the heresiarch replied, Dionysius also said, “As being a thing made, He was not before He was produced.”³ If Arius asserted, the Sox of God is not similar to the FATHER in substance,—Dionysius had said, He is different (we might rather say, *alien*,) from the

Causes of the rapid progress of Arianism.

¹ Bull, D. F. N. iii. 4.

² Socrat. H. E. i. 6.

³ Arius :—Διὸ καὶ ἦν ποτὲ, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. Κτίσμα γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ ποίημα ὁ Υἱός.

(Socrat. p. 11, 30.) S. Dionysius :—καὶ γὰρ ὡς ποίημα ὦν, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται. (S. Athan. de Sent. S. Dion. § 4.)

FATHER in substance.¹ And though the Catholics might rejoin, and we may allow, and have allowed, that the Patriarch was speaking of the SON of GOD as regarded His Humanity,—or that he was merely stating the case very strongly against Sabellianism, or that, whatever he meant at the time, he gave it a Catholic explanation afterwards, *for he never retracted it*, the statement of the Arians would seem to a mind incapable of weighing evidence far more plausible than the laborious, however true, explanation of the Catholics. This is but one instance of the manner in which we must conceive those in the Communion of the Church to have understated the strong points of the Arians. There must, too, among the latter, have been much apparent holiness of life: and doubtless, among the earlier followers of Arius, much real conscientiousness. And here again it is certain that the Catholics, fully (and most justly) persuaded that heresy implies a wicked heart, spoke of those as notoriously flagitious, whose heterodoxy was the only proof that they were so. We cannot imagine that the people of Ptolemais, after having been governed by a Martyr like S. Theodore, could quietly have submitted to the rule of Secundus, his successor, and the patron of Arius, had he been at that time in appearance the villain that S. Athanasius calls him,² and that he afterwards proved himself to be.

But, after all, these considerations, though full weight be granted them, are far too confined to account for the instantaneous stride of Arianism from the weakness of infancy to the strength of a giant. Alexander and Arius are not to be regarded as simply the heads of two contending factions; but as the embodiments of two principles, which had from the beginning conflicted in the Church, but had never encountered each other on the same scale as now. That the tradition of the Church, from Apostolic times, was in favour of the teaching of S. Alexander, was sanctioned by the Council of Nicaea, and asserted the true and proper Divinity of the SAVIOUR, is a point that has been triumphantly proved by Catholics of all ages. But it is not less true, that a tradition, disavowed by the Church, but still existing in it, an under-current to the recognised course of

¹ Arius:—Οὐτε δὲ ὁμοίους κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ Πατρὶ ἔστιν. . . . (Socrat. ubi supra.) S. Dionysius:—ξένον κατ'

οὐσίαν Αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ Πατρὸς. (S. Athan. de Sent. § 4.)

² ὁ παγκάκιστος. Orat. i. cont. Arian.

the stream, had also existed from primitive times: and taught the opposite doctrine. It was this principle which, assuming different appearances, but still acting to the same end, had in the first century broken forth in the heresies of Cerinthus and Ebion, in the third, in that of Paul of Samosata; and now, finding the Church free from external tribulations, made Arius its mouthpiece. It was but necessary to strike the chord, and in every country hearts were found to respond; the train had long since been laid, and the weakest hand could fire it. The creed of Arius was not heard by his disciples as something new and unknown; they recognised it as the true and boldly developed expression of what they had previously held by implication, but had shrunk from acknowledging nakedly. It is easy to see that many of the texts quoted on both sides in defence of their doctrine, could never have been so cited, had they not come down to them invested with a traditional explanation:—for instance, “My heart hath produced a good Word,” on the part of the Catholics; “For we which live are always,” on that of the Arians. And thus it happens that a City Priest has hardly been condemned in Alexandria, when Egypt echoes with his doctrine; hardly anathematized in a Provincial Synod, when Antioch and the whole East is lit up with the controversy.

Arianism in
Mareotis.

For it was soon evident that the Council of Alexandria was insufficient to stop the evil. Pistus, a priest of Marcotis, who had apparently been condemned with Arius, was considered second only to him in talents and influence: and he was afterwards raised, by the heretical faction, to the Episcopate of Alexandria. The Deacon Euzoius, then one of the most zealous among the new party, attained, as we shall see, to the same dignity at Antioch.¹

Eusebius of
Nicomedia:

But now a new actor appeared on the stage, who quickly reduced Arius, however he might still be considered the head of his own peculiar sect, to a second rank in the grand movement that was troubling the Church. This was Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia; one of the most hateful characters whom history records. He was possessed of all the talents which were the most likely to give influence at court: an insinuating manner, a ready flow of eloquence, the reality of some learning, the affectation of more; an insatiable ambition, a conscience that

¹ B. E. V. p. x. and Tillemont, vi. 2, 14.

never stood in the way of preferment : a sanctity of demeanour <sup>his charac-
ter :</sup> so great, that miracles were ascribed to him ; an inward depravity so foul that he is accused of having joined Licinius in his persecution. To that tyrant he had rendered essential services ; and had even borne arms for him. Raised to the See of Berytus in Phœnicia, in a manner contrary to the Canons, and which gave some reason for doubting whether he had ever received valid consecration, he found himself discontented with the comparative obscurity of that city, though one of the largest in those parts ; and casting his eye on those sees which from time to time became vacant, he could find none more suitable to his projects than that of Nicomedia. Not only was this city reckoned the fifth in the world,¹ but it possessed the principal palace of the Eastern Emperor, which Diocletian had built there : and as the Metropolis of Bithynia, it gave considerable ecclesiastical authority. Eusebius had already acquired great influence over Constantia, the sister of Constantine, and wife of Licinius ; and this influence probably procured him the translation that he coveted. The Faithful of Nicomedia had no voice in the matter² : the mandate of the Emperor prevailed ; and so flagrant a violation of the Canons as an unnecessary translation was allowed to pass unnoticed or uncondemned. For Eusebius was one whom no man cared to offend ; and they who did were sure, sooner or later, to rue his anger. He never forgot ; and never forgave.

In what manner Arius and Eusebius had first become acquainted, it is impossible now to discover. They had long before the time of which we write, communicated to each other their sentiments on the Divinity of the Sox, and found them similar. Arius, as the more fearless of the two, carried his teaching to what his friend must sometimes have considered an imprudent length ;— <sup>his friend-
ship with
Arius :</sup> nevertheless the league between them was firmly kept, and lasted till they were called to give an account of their evil deeds. In fact, Eusebius, after the character of the Eastern teaching, was probably the earlier inventor of the Arian system ; and he always gloried in being a *Collucianist*,³ that is, a fellow

¹ Libanius, Or. 8. Tillemont explains the four cities to be Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople or Carthage ; probably the latter.

² Theodoret, H. E. i. 20, (p. 50, 18, Ed. Reading.)

³ Theodoret, H. E. i. 5 (23, 9).

thinker with S. Lucian of Antioch, who, whatever might have been the orthodoxy of his own faith, (which he had sealed by a glorious Martyrdom) had the misfortune of having numbered among his disciples a great part of the champions of early Arianism, or rather Eusebianism.

Arius, shortly after the Council, was compelled to leave Alexandria; perhaps because he thought that the dissemination of his heresy required his presence elsewhere; perhaps because he was banished (as he himself asserts) by Alexander.¹ For however extraordinary this power may appear in the Prelate of a yet heathen city, it is no more than was exercised, as we have already seen,² by S. Demetrius, on far less provocation, with respect to Origen. The thoughts of Arius naturally turned to Asia; but before leaving Egypt, he addressed a letter to Eusebius, to acquaint him with the state of affairs, and to ask his sympathy. This epistle, which is extant,³ displays most fully the character of the two men. On the side of Arius, there is abject flattery; falsehoods which he and Eusebius must equally have known to be so; the most unfounded calumnies against Alexander, and the most determined perseverance in his own doctrine. The unbounded vanity of Eusebius, his willingness to be deceived, his wish to deceive, are most clearly displayed in this letter of his correspondent.—“Your sentiments,” he replied,⁴ “are just;—that which was made was not before it had been made, because its existence had a beginning.”

Arius, on this, went into Palestine, accompanied by several of his followers, and among the rest, by Carponas and Achillas.⁵ Here his flattery won on many of the Prelates: he represented himself as one who ardently desired peace, but had been persecuted by his Bishop for the maintenance of dogmas ever held in the Church, and not invented by him; he brought forward his

¹ Tillemont is probably right in imagining (vi. 2, 18), that Arius had his own reasons for wishing to quit Alexandria, as Sozomen (i. 15,) asserts. But had he recollected the instance of Demetrius, he could never have said, of the banishment of Arius by Alexander,—“*Quoique cela soit encore plus difficile à croire et à comprendre qu'à justifier.*”

² Ante, p. 28.

³ Theodoret, H. E. i. 5.

⁴ At least, if Tillemont be right in ascribing to that reply the few lines which S. Athanasius (*De Synodis*,) has preserved of a letter from Eusebius to Arius.

⁵ S. Epiphani. *Hær.* 69,

who,
banished
from Alex-
andria,

writes to
him,

goes into
Palestine,

own views with more or less distinctness, as he saw the minds of those whom he addressed more or less disposed to embrace them, and he requested their interference with Alexander to receive him again to communion. Many fell into the snare, and, with really good intentions, furnished him with the letters which he requested; some embraced the pernicious doctrine of the heretic; and but a very few stood on their guard, and requested Alexander not to re-admit Arius till he had given some satisfactory proof of penitence.

The Bishops who were the most active partizans of Arius, in addition to Eusebius, Secundus, and Theonas, were Theognis of Nicæa, Menophantes of Ephesus, Maris of Chalcædon, Patrophilus of Scythopolis,¹ Theodotus of Laodicea, Paulinus of Tyre, Athanasius of Anazarbus,² Gregory of Berytus, Actius of Lydda; those most opposed to him were S. Macarius of Jerusalem, S. Philogonius of Antioch, and Hellanicus of Tripoli.

Alexander, though an old man, took the most active measures to defend the Faith. Provincial Councils were held in several parts of Egypt: and the Patriarch wrote letters to all provinces of the Church, entreating the various Prelates to contend earnestly for the Truth, and to refuse Communion to Arius. As many as seventy of these are known to have existed; and a century later they were collected as curiosities. But two only of them remain to us. They were not without their effect; and those addressed to the Bishops of Palestine, among others to the celebrated historian, Eusebius of Cæsarea, a man disposed towards Arianism, but wishing to stand well with all parties, obliged Arius to retire to Nicomedia. The subtle Eusebius, of Nicomedia, now openly coming forward as his champion, wrote again and again to Alexander to rescind his condemnation; and Arius himself addressed a letter to his Bishop, which we still have.

Efforts of S. Alexander:

Arius retires to Nicomedia:

he writes to S. Alexander

He professed to believe in One God; Only wise, good, just

¹ This was the ancient Bethshan: τὴν Βαιθσαν, ἥ ἐστὶ Σκυθῶν πόλις, say the LXX. (Judges, i. 27.) It was for many ages the Metropolis of Palestina Secunda, till that honour was more fitly assigned by the Latins to Nazareth. Le Quien, iii. 681.

² This was then a town of Cilicia

Prima, but afterwards became the Metropolis, ecclesiastical as well as civil, of Cilicia Secunda, and later still, having been destroyed by earthquakes, was rebuilt by Justin, and took his name. It is now an Armenian Archiepiscopate under the Catholic of Sis.

and powerful ; in One Son of GOD begotten by Him before the worlds ; by Whom He made the worlds ; begotten by Him, not in appearance, but in verity ; created by Him unchangeable ; though a Creature, yet not like His other creatures ; though a Son, not like His other sons : not come forth from the FATHER, as Valentinus held ; not consubstantial with Him, as Manes taught ; not confounded with Him, as Sabellius averred : “all which heresies,” adds Arius, addressing Alexander, “yourself, Blessed Pope, have condemned.” From the FATHER, he proceeds, the SON received life and glory : the FATHER is the Source of all : so that in the Godhead are three Hypostases. And the epistle concludes with the assertion that S. Alexander had formerly taught the doctrine now condemned by him,—the existence of the FATHER before the SON. This confession of faith was signed by such disciples of Arius as were with him at Nicomedia ; and when it reached Egypt, by Secundus, Theonas, and probably others.

Encyclic
Epistle of S.
Alexander.

It was probably not till then that Alexander wrote an encyclic Epistle, containing a brief history of the Arian Schism, and an exposition of the True Faith. It opens thus beautifully :

“To his beloved and most honourable fellow ministers in all parts of the Catholic Church, Alexander, Salutation in the LORD.

“Since the body of the Catholic Church is one, and there is a command in the Divine Scriptures, that we should keep the bond of like-mindedness and peace, it follows that we by letter should signify to each other that which happens to each ; that whether one member suffer, all the members may suffer with it, or whether it joy, all may rejoice with it. Wherefore, in our Diocese, certain men have gone forth, workers of iniquity and the enemies of CHRIST, teaching an Apostacy which may well be thought and called the forerunner of Antichrist. I would fain have consigned a matter of this sort to silence, that, if it might be so, the evil might have an end in the apostates alone, lest, getting abroad into other places, it should defile the ears of the simple. But since Eusebius, now Bishop of Nicomedia, thinking that the affairs of the Church depend upon him, because, without receiving punishment, he hath forsaken his See of Berytus and set eyes on that of Nicomedia, takes

the lead of these apostates, and hath taken in hand to write to all quarters, commending them, if perchance he may secretly draw the ignorant into the worst heresy,—that which fights against CHRIST,—I have thought it necessary to break silence, as knowing that which is written in the law, and to narrate the thing to all of you, so that ye may both know them that are apostates, and the unhappy dogmas of their heresy, and if Eusebius writes, may pay no regard to him.” After stating the facts of the case,¹ and setting forth the Apostolic Truth, S. Alexander concludes thus:—

“But we do not think it strange. The case was the same with Hymenæus and Philetus, and before them with Judas, who, when he had been a follower of the LORD, afterwards became a traitor and an apostate. And concerning these men themselves, we have not been left untaught. But the LORD hath said before, ‘Take heed that no man deceive you: For many shall come in My Name, saying, I am CHRIST, and the time draweth near, and shall deceive many: go not after them.’ And Paul, who had learnt these things from the SAVIOUR, wrote, that in the last days some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and to doctrines of devils, turning themselves away from the truth. Seeing then our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST hath signified concerning these things, both by Himself and the Apostle, we, who have been hearers for ourselves of their ungodly words, have accordingly delivered them over to an anathema, and have declared them to be aliens from the Catholic Church and the Faith. And we have set forth the matter to your piety, beloved and honourable fellow ministers, that if any of them come unto you, ye may not receive them, nor give heed to Eusebius nor to any other that write to you on their behalf. For we that are Christians ought to turn away from those that speak or think anything against CHRIST, as enemies of God and destroyers of souls, and not so much as bid them God speed,

¹ Many writers on ecclesiastical history place this letter far earlier in the controversy, because, in giving the names of those who had fallen away, S. Alexander says nothing of Pistus and the Marcotists. Undoubtedly, this is a difficulty, but not so great as the

supposition that Eusebius, after the exposure of his character which this letter contains, would again have written to Alexander on behalf of Arius,—which yet must be the case if we place the letter itself earlier.

lest we be partakers of their iniquities, as Blessed John exhorted us afore. Salute the brethren that are with you: they that are with me salute you." This letter was signed by a large body of Priests and Deacons, in token of their approval.

Arius, on his part, continued to receive letters of sympathy from various Bishops, and to exhibit them for the encouragement of his partizans. He also acquired influence from another source. Eusebius introduced him to the feeble-minded Constantia; and the heretic had address to win her entirely to his sentiments. Another triumph awaited him. Eusebius assembled a Provincial Council of Bithynia, and appears formally to have admitted Arius to the Communion of the Church. Authorized by this false synod, the Metropolitan, after the example of Alexander, despatched letters on all sides (as indeed in a less degree he had hitherto done¹): one of these, to Paulinus of Tyre, is preserved by Theodoret.² In this he calls on that Bishop, as one possessed of great influence, to keep silence no longer, but openly to assert what he privately acknowledged to be the truth.

It was at this time that Arius composed that infamous work, his *Thalia*:—a work which must have proved to all earnest-minded men, that God had given him over to a reprobate mind. It was an exposition of his principles written in the style and verse of Sotades, one of the most immoral of heathen poets. The airs, the measure, the whole effect of the verse inspired horror and disgust to the better part of the heathens themselves; and Pagans, who even professed no extraordinary purity, shrank from the writings of Sotades. And this was the pattern whom a Christian Priest, in treating of the most exalted doctrines of the faith, professed to follow; these the ideas which he desired to associate with arguments concerning the sublimest mysteries of religion! Of all the writings of Arius, this inspired the faithful with the deepest loathing.

Nevertheless, George, a Priest and philosopher of Alexandria,³ who then happened to be spending some time at Nicomedia, endeavoured to interfere on behalf of Arius, and wrote to his

Constantia
perverted by
Arius:

Pseudo-
Council of
Bithynia:

Arius com-
poses the
Thalia:

¹ For S. Alexander, in his encyclic Epistle, mentions the letters of Eusebius, as we have seen. But had that Epistle been written subsequently to

the Council of Bithynia,—some notice would surely have been taken of it.

² Theodoret, H. E. i. 6.

³ Philostorgius, H. E. viii. 17.

Bishop, requesting that he might be re-admitted to Communion. The only consequence was that this man, whom S. Athanasius terms the most wicked of the Arians, was himself deposed by Alexander from the Priesthood. This loss, as we shall see, was soon counterbalanced by the favour of his new friends. Refused admittance into the Clergy of Antioch by S. Eustathius, then Bishop of that See, he obtained it on the deposition of that Saint, and was shortly afterwards elevated to the See of Laodicea.

George
deposed :

From whatever reason, Arius preferred a residence in Palestine to one at Nicomedia. He accordingly went into that country, and presented a petition to three of the Bishops on whose goodwill he could count,—Paulinus of Tyre, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Patrophilus of Seythopolis,—of an almost unprecedented nature. He requested that he might be allowed to assemble his own followers for the Divine Offices, as he had done when Parish Priest at Alexandria. The Prelates met to consider the demand, and agreed to it. It is wonderful that they could be blind to the inconsistency of their own conduct : they would not communicate with one whom S. Alexander had, wrongfully in their opinion, pronounced a heretic ; but they allowed him to add schism to heresy, and that in their own Dioceses. It was now that Arius, finding himself exempted by ecclesiastical authority, such as it was, from all jurisdiction whatever, took upon himself to alter the Doxology to a form, which, containing in itself nothing contrary to the Catholic Faith, yet allowed of an heretical interpretation:—*Glory be to the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Ghost*. He was anxious also to change the formula of Baptism ; but this appeared, for the present, too hazardous an enterprize.

Pseudo-
Council of
Palestine :

The various collections of letters made respectively by Arius and Alexander seemed to answer no further end than that of exciting emulation, and increasing controversy. Alexander, probably by the advice of Athanasius, whom he consulted in all things, devised another plan. He drew up a Confession of Faith, or, as it is generally termed, a Tome,¹ which he dispatched

Tome of S.
Alexander.

¹ This Tome is by some writers considered identical with the encyclic letter, which we have before mentioned. Baronius (318, lxvii.), and the

Benedictine Editors in their Life of S. Athanasius, support this opinion ; but it does not seem to have even a plausible foundation, any more than that

to all quarters, and requested the signatures of the various Bishops. It was signed by the whole of his own Diocese, which contained, as we have seen, about one hundred Prelates; by those of Cappadocia, in number about fifteen; of Lycia, in number about thirty-two; of Pamphylia, in number about thirty-seven; of Asia Proper, about forty-three; and others. Thus we cannot imagine the whole number of signatures to have been less than two hundred and fifty.

When affairs had attained this condition, Alexander wrote the other Epistle which we have mentioned as still extant.

It is addressed to S. Alexander of Byzantium, who was not only an unshaken champion of orthodoxy, but appears to have been the tried friend of his namesake. This is the first communication that we find between the Churches of Alexandria and Constantinople, afterwards so closely to be linked together; nor was it from any superior dignity in the latter See, but simply from the venerable character of the Prelate, that Alexander consulted him in this emergency. According to some,¹ the Bishop of Byzantium was but the second that had governed that See:—others, but perhaps with less probability, make him the fifth.²

A.D. 323.*

The Epistle is of great length; and complains bitterly of the violence of the Arians. Then, as during the whole course of that heresy, its supporters seem to have relied on female influence for the propagation of their dogmas; the busy intermeddling

of Valesius, that the Tome and the letter which mentions it are identical. A more difficult question is the date of the Epistle to Alexander of Constantinople. Valesius considers it to have been written before the residence of Arius at Nicomedia, because it says nothing of Eusebius; but not to mention that this would involve the difficulty of the Tome having been written before the encyclic epistle, the Bishop of Alexandria, in his letter to Alexander, speaks of three Syrian Bishops as favouring Arius. If we apply this to the permission given him by Eusebius of Cæsarea, Patrophilus, and Paulinus, to hold schismatic assemblies, the whole chronology fits in

satisfactorily. This is Tillemont's reasoning (vi. i. 478, note 6), and it seems very just.

¹ Conf. Chron. Pasch. — τῆς ἐν Βυζαντίῳ ἐκκλησίας ἡγεῖται πρῶτος Μητροφάνης, with Socrat. H. E. i. 37 (p. 71, 27), Ἀλεξανδρος . . . Μητροφάνην πάλαι διαδεξάμενος.

² So Simeon Metaphrastes in his Annals. For the Catalogue of Pseudo Dorotheus of Tyre, giving a list of twenty-six Bishops between S. Andrew and S. Alexander, is a mere forgery. Le Quien, i. 205, 6.

Sozomen, i. 15. (p. 33. 5.)

* We follow, in this date, the Benedictine Editors of S. Athanasius. Tillemont prefers the date 321, be-

spirit of the young women whom they had perverted to heresy at Alexandria, gave great occasion to the heathen to blaspheme. He complains of the reception of the Arian clerks, by some Prelates, contrary to the Apostolic Canon, into the Church; and calls it a grievous blot on the offenders. This Canon is probably the Sixteenth, which forbids the reception of a deposed Clerk, as a Clerk, in another Diocese.¹ After a short narration of this sort, which infers that his correspondent was already acquainted with the general features of the case, Alexander proceeds to a confutation of the Arian theory, and doubtless drew largely on the almost inspired genius of his Deacon. He concludes his refutation thus:

“This we teach; this we preach;—these are the Apostolic dogmas of the Church, for which we are ready even to lay down our lives, making small account of them that would compel us to forswear them, even though they would force us by torture, and not turning away from the hope that is in them. Which things seeing that Arius and Achillas opposed, and they that with them are adversaries of the Truth, they have been cast out of the Church, as enemies to our pious doctrine, according as Blessed Paul saith, If any preach unto you another Gospel than that ye have received, though he feign himself an Angel from Heaven, Let him be anathema.”

He then proceeds to the subject of the Tome, to which he requests the signature of Alexander; and mentions that together with it he had sent by the same messenger, Apion, a Deacon of

cause he understands Alexander's expression about the Arians, τοὺς διωγμὸν ἡμῶν ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐπεγείραντας to prove that the letter must have been written in time of peace, that is, before the persecution of Licinius, or, at latest, in 321. But the words need only imply that, in a previous time of peace, the Arians had done so. Or, even in Tillemont's sense, if we understand the persecution of that in Egypt, that province, in being so distant from the court, might have remained quiet long after the commencement of the general persecution.—On Tillemont's hypothesis, three years, 321—324,

remain without any historical notice of Arianism;—a thing which in the heat of the controversy is hardly possible. This he owns: but supposes that it may be accounted for by the persecution allaying the controversy: a persecution which, as he owns, “n'a jamais esté tout-à-fait violente, et le fut peutestre encore moins en Egypte.” (vii. 477. note 6.)

¹ Beveridge applies it at one time to this Canon, wherein he agrees with Petrus de Marca and others, and is probably right;—at another (Vind. Can. Apost. i. 13.) to the Twelfth. See Reading's note, (Theodor. p. ii. not. a.)

Alexandria, copies of some of the letters he had received from other Prelates. We cannot doubt how this Epistle was received by the holy Bishop to whom it was addressed. Of the other seventy persons to whom Alexander wrote on the same subject, we only know S. Sylvester¹ of Rome, S. Macarius of Jerusalem, Asclepas of Gaza, Longinus of Ascalon, Macrinus of Jamnina, and Zeno, who appears to have been ex-Bishop of Tyre.

Towards the close of this Epistle, Alexander mentions that the Arians, as much as in them lay, had excited persecution against the Church in time of peace.

Persecution
of Licinius:

We must now say a few words on the persecution of Licinius. It seems to have been commenced, as much out of pique at the superior power of Constantine, as from any other cause: and it was carried on with more or less vigour, principally against the Bishops, but never with any great degree of ferocity, for about seven years. Its most illustrious Martyr in Egypt was S. Donatus,² Bishop of Thmuis, and the successor of the Martyr S. Philcas. A native of some insignificant town in Istria, he went to Aquileia for the purpose of evangelizing the surrounding country:—when the persecution of Diocletian grew violent, he retired into Dalmatia, and led an eremitical life on the summit of a high mountain. Having confessed before Diocletian himself, and having by his exemplary courage converted Macarius and Theodorus, two of the bystanders, he, in company with them, sailed to Egypt. Happening to pass through Thmuis, probably on his way to the Mountain of S. Antony, he was elected Bishop of that See, and governed it for several years, raising Macarius to the Priesthood, and Theodorus to the

¹ As Baronius (318. lix.) takes all due care to point out. Pope Liberius, in his letter to Constantine, (printed in Biblioth. Sanct. Tom. ix.) speaks of this letter as still existing. The Cardinal a little strains facts when he says, “Constat imprimis eundem Alexandrum de iis que ab ipso gesta essent adversus Arium scripsisse literas ad primariæ sedis Episcopum, &c.”—there being no authority either for or against the statement. The other names are known from S. Epiphanius, Hær. 69.

² His Acts are in Bollandus, under May 22: but are tricked out with imaginary incidents and conversations, in the tastes of the Greek Martyrologists. Le Quien (ii. 539) professes to abstract them, but is very inaccurate. The year in which S. Donatus suffered is quite uncertain, and there seems no reason for believing with Cardonus, (Comment. Præv. § 2,) that it was so early as A. D. 316.

Diaconate. They finished their course gloriously under Licinius, being cut piecemeal; a method of execution which, as Eusebius informs us,¹ was not unusual in this persecution.

martyrdom
of SS. Dona-
tius, Maca-
rius, and
Theodorus.

Justly enraged at the injuries inflicted by Licinius, both on his religion and on his empire, Constantine marched against him. The armies met at Adrianople: Pagans and Christians alike owned the supernatural terror which the Labarum struck into its opponents.—Licinius left more than thirty thousand men on the field of battle, and retreated towards Asia. At Chalcedon a second and more decisive engagement was fought: Licinius was totally defeated and taken prisoner: the conqueror spared his life, but sent him to Thessalonica: and there, as his restless spirit urged him on to fresh attempts at agitation, he was strangled in the course of the succeeding year.

Constantine
overthrows
Licinius:

Constantine, thus become Master of the world, learnt with deep sorrow the distracted state of the East. But, unhappily, Eusebius of Nicomedia, far from being overwhelmed in the ruin of his patron Licinius, obtained equal, if not greater influence over the mind of the new Emperor. Capricious almost to imbecility by nature, elated by his rapid and extraordinary rise, naturally regarded with the greatest deference by the Prelates of that Church which he had saved from persecution, and believing himself, though a mere catechumen, as qualified to be the supreme moderator of ecclesiastical, as well as civil, affairs, Constantine presented the character most exactly suited to the insidious attacks of such a master of finesse as Eusebius. It was easy to represent to the Emperor that the controversy at Alexandria had arisen from the discussion of an unimportant question, which ought never to have been mooted, or, when unfortunately raised, to have been instantly quashed;—that a frivolous distinction had lighted up discord throughout the Earth, had divided families, and separated friends:—and that the only remedy lay in compelling the authors of the controversy to reconciliation. Constantine fell into the snare:—and he wrote, or it were more true to say, suffered Eusebius to write in his name, the disgraceful epistle, which Eusebius the Historian has from his hatred to Catholic Doctrine, taken pleasure in pre-

becomes
sole Em-
peror:

receives a
false impres-
sion of the
Arian dis-
putes from
Eusebius:

¹ Euseb. Vit. Constant. ii. 2.

serving to us whole, if, indeed, he have not, contrary to his profession, mutilated and corrupted it.¹

writes to
Alexander
and Arius,

It is addressed simply "to Alexander and Arius"; and its whole tenor is based on this one notion,—that if Arius had been somewhat too pertinacious in refusing, Alexander had been tyrannical in exacting the profession of an unimportant dogma; that such disputes might be beneficial as exercises of subtlety, and mediums of oratorical display, but that when discussed by the vulgar, incapable of curious distinctions and accurate definitions, they became highly injurious and perilous: that no essential part of the Christian Law was at stake, no new dogma in the worship of God had been introduced: that philosophers of different sects lived in friendly communication,—much more should the teachers of Christianity agree to differ: that they who should be the first in binding their people together in peace, were the authors of innumerable and interminable discussions. "Restore to me," concludes the Emperor, "quiet days, and nights void of care: that henceforward I may have the joy of Pure Light, and the gladness of a quiet life. This if I gain not, I must needs lament, and be dissolved in tears, and go heavily for the remainder of my days. For when the people of God, my fellow servants, are divided by unjust and harmful contention, how can I be of unmoved soul? Open to me, by your reconciliation, the way to the East, which ye have closed by your contentions: and allow me speedily to behold yourselves and all other people at union, so that I may be enabled, with the unanimous accordance of every mouth, to return thanks to God for the common concord and liberty of all."

To this effect wrote Eusebius of Nicodemia: thus openly did he declare the dispute to be a mere strife of words which involved the question, whether the SAVIOUR were a mere creature, or Very God of Very God. The state of Arius himself, who boldly accused the Catholics of idolatry, were surely enviable, in comparison with that of this Bishop.

and
dispatches
the letter
by Hosius,
of Cordova;

The messenger who was entrusted with the Royal Letter was Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, a Prelate who was destined to act a foremost part in the troublous times that followed;—and one who, had he not lived too long for his own fame, might have

¹ See Baronius's remarks on the subject, 318. xc.

held the second place among the Saints that suffered in the Arian persecution. He was now almost seventy years of age, so that he had not only stood firm during the persecution of Maximian, which raged with peculiar fury in Spain, but must have well remembered that of Aurelian. How Eusebius could suggest or consent to the nomination of such a Commissioner, it is difficult to say: unless the great age, well known sanctity, and tried prudence of Hosius, rendered the Emperor's choice¹ too manifestly proper to be gainsaid. He was also charged with an inquiry, as it would appear,² into the conduct of the Meletians and Coluthians; and was to use his influence in composing the long continued disputes concerning the proper time of the celebration of Easter.³

A.D., 324,*
December, or
A.D., 325,
Jan.

On the arrival of Hosius, a Council was held at Alexandria, the acts of which have unfortunately perished. It only appears that the heresy both of Arius, and, as the natural consequence, of Sabellius, were thoroughly sifted;—that the word *Consubstantial* was formally approved;—that Arius was excommunicated afresh; that the Meletians were condemned anew;—and that Coluthus and his partisans were summoned before the Synod. His assumed power of ordination was derided as an unheard of novelty:—those on whom he had laid hands, (and among them, the afterwards notorious Ischyra,) were reduced to the rank of laymen; but both the schismatic and the greater part of his followers were, on their recantation, admitted to the Communion of the Church. How, as we have elsewhere said,

Council of
Alexandria:
the Arians
condemned.

recantation
of Coluthus.

¹ It is really melancholy, as shewing how unfair a controversial spirit will render the best men, to read Baronius's account (319. xxvi.) of the legation of Hosius by S. Sylvester of Rome to Alexandria;—a supposition for which there is absolutely not the slightest authority, except the Historian's own "*satis significatum videtur.*"

² Euseb. Vit. Constant. Lib. ii. Conf. capp. 62, 63.

³ Sozomen. H. E. I. 16.

* Pagi in Baron. 319. iv. Tillemont places it (vi. 1. 385) a year earlier. The mission of Hosius can

hardly be placed before the end of 324, because the battle of Adrianople was only fought in July;—then followed that near Chalcedon; and the necessary settlement of the Empire could hardly have given Eusebius time to acquire an ascendancy over the Emperor's mind, in that same year.—Nor can it be later than February, because Constantine, after having written to S. Alexander, went to Thessalonica, where he already was on the 18th of March, and because of the numerous events that occurred between it and the Synod of Nicæa.

could the Council have come to such a determination on the Orders conferred by Coluthus, if within the memory of living men, the Bishop of Alexandria had received no other ordination?

Arian
outbreaks :

The Arians, throughout Egypt and the Thebais, on the result of the Council being known, joined by the Meletians, committed the wildest acts of fury. They insulted the Catholics; they cast stones at the statues of the Emperor;—every petty town was filled with controversial disputes. The contemporary Fathers give a lively picture of the popular interest, and fearful irreverence displayed on the question. On asking for the necessities of life in the inn, in the bath, at the shop of the baker or that of the shoemaker, the inquirer, instead of receiving the reply he expected, was met with the answer, “Great is the Only-Begotten, but greater is He That begot.” Women were more especially active in propagating the new sentiments; and the female disciples of Arius were, in particular, the curse of Alexandria.

Arius, on this, addressed a letter to Constantine, complaining of his unjust excommunication; and the Emperor replied by an Epistle, not indeed without its force of argument and vigour of expression, but utterly unworthy of the author and the occasion, inasmuch as it condescends to play on the name and to ridicule the person of the heretic.¹ It concluded with an invitation to Arius to plead his own cause at court. This letter was brought to Alexandria by the Public Couriers, Syncletius and Gaudentius,² and was fixed in the public places of this and the other principal cities of the Empire. Arius, however, did not lose courage, but presented himself personally to Constantine, on whom, though he concealed the poison of his heresy, he was not, at that time, able to make a favourable impression.

Convocation
of the Coun-
cil of Nicæa.

At length, wearied out with disputes, and urged by the authority of Alexander and Hosius, Constantine summoned an Œcumenical Council, at the city of Nicæa in Bithynia, for the fourteenth day of June,³ A.D. 325.

¹ Gelasius, Hist. Conc. Nic. iii. 1.

² Baronius, 319. xxi.

³ It would lead us too far from our immediate subject to discuss its date, for and against which there is

much to be said. It is most probable that the Council, for whatever day it might have been convoked, was not opened till June 19. Tillemont, vi. 3. 912. Note 1.

SECTION XVI.

THE GREAT AND ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OF NICÆA.

IF, on commencing the relation of an arduous war, it be the practice of profane historians to number the contending chieftains, to characterize their various constitutions of mind, to catalogue their most illustrious actions, and thus to bring them forth on the field of battle,—much more, about to enter on the most fearful struggle in which the Church was ever engaged, and to write of its august opening in the ever memorable Council of Nicæa, may we be allowed to pause for a moment on the principal Prelates who there assembled, and on the noble deeds of this great host of the King of Kings. Among these ^{The Fathers assemble at Nicæa :} “three hundred and eighteen trained servants”¹ of the True Abraham, were men who carried about with them the glorious marks of Confession in the Tenth Persecution,—men on whom distant Churches had hung as Columns of the One Faith,—men, in whom the Apostolic gifts still dwelt in all their pristine vigour,—men, who had not only the power of binding and loosing in Heaven, but of healing diseases, and of raising the dead, on earth. They gathered from every province of the known world, an exceeding great army of Prelates, an innumerable multitude of Priests and Deacons; they came to compare the Creeds taught in their Churches by the Apostolic founders of each, and to bear witness to the Truth of the same HOLY GHOST That spoke by all;—they came to invest traditional faith with infallible words, and to rear an everlasting bulwark between the Church and heresy:—they assembled from Italy and Spain, and Africa, and the Goths, and Palestine, and Cappadocia, and Isauria, and Egypt, and Mesopotamia, and the Pentapolis; the Euphrates and the Guadalquiver, the Tiber and the Nile, the Danube and the Orontes, sent forth their champions for the Verity of the

¹ Genesis xiv. 14.

names of
the principal
Bishops.

Catholic Creed, and the Glory of the Consubstantial. There was S. Macarius of Jerusalem, illustrious for many miracles: there was S. Eustathius of Antioch, who had raised a dead man to life: there was S. James of Nisibis, who by the power of his intercession routed Sapor and all the flower of the Persian host; there was S. Leontius of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, “the equal of the Angels,” and the spiritual Father of many Martyrs; S. Hypatius of Gangra, who himself attained the Crown of Martyrdom, and breathed out his spirit in a petition for his murderers; S. Paul of Neocæsarea, who had been mutilated in the persecution of Licinius; S. Alexander of Constantinople, at whose supplication Divine Vengeance overwhelmed Arius; S. Nicasius of Die,¹ the only delegate from the ever orthodox Gaul; Protogenes of Sardica, the bulwark of the Dacian Church; S. Meletius of Sebastopolis, who fought his good fight in Armenia; S. Spiridion of Tremithus, the glory of Cyprus; S. Achilleus of Larissa, the Athanasius of Thessaly; S. Gelasius of Salamis, who had been all but a Martyr; and multitudes of other Prelates, whose names, less famous in the Church Militant, were doubtless not the less surely written in the Book of Life.

S. Alexander
and his
Prelates:

In such an august assembly, then, did S. Alexander, with twenty of his Prelates,² appear. Of these the most famous were S. Potamon of Heraclea, who had lost an eye under

¹ See Tillemont, vi. 3. 687.

² We reserve a list of these Prelates for a note:—Harpocraton of Naucratis, (the birthplace of Athenæus); Atlas of Schedia,—a city a little to the East of Alexandria;—in the list of signatures, it is by mistake placed in Thebais; Caius of Phthenoth, (which gave its name to a branch of the Nile); Dorotheus of Pelusium; Caius of Thmuis, the successor of S. Phileas and S. Donatus; Darius of Rhinocorura, or Farma, the boundary city of Asia and Africa; Philip of Panephyssus; Alberion of Pharbæthus; Adamantius of Cynopolis the lower; Antiochus of Memphis; Harpocraton of Cynopolis in Heptanomus,

who played a distinguished part in the Synod; (Socrat. H. E. i. 18); Tyrrannus of Antinoë, who appears to have been originally a Meletian; Volusianus of Lycopolis, who had been consecrated in the place of Meletius; Titus of Parætonium; Serapion, probably of Antiphæ;—all these were Catholics:—Dathes of Berenice; Zephyrius of Barce; Secundus of Teuchiri, besides the ex-Bishops, Secundus of Ptolemais, and Theonas of Marmarica, Arians. In these names, we have followed Le Quien’s authority: who gives them partly conjecturally, partly from Arabic MSS., in the Royal Library at Paris.

Maximin, and whom we shall see hereafter a faithful Martyr, under Constantius;—and S. Paphnutius, from the Thebais, so renowned for his Confession and Sanctity. But of all that went from the Diocese of Alexandria, S. Athanasius, at that great crisis, stood foremost. Among the Egyptian Prelates were three, Secundus, Zephyrius, and Dathes, who were infected with Arianism; they were all from Libya, a proof how great was the influence that Arius, Secundus and Theonas had possessed in their own neighbourhood. The Egyptian Bishops, as all the other Fathers, were furnished with public conveyances, and had every expense paid, by a rescript of the Emperor issued for that purpose.

It is evidently beyond our proposed scheme to write more at length of the proceedings at Nicæa, than may be necessary for the perfect understanding of the affairs of that Church whose history we have taken in hand to relate. The condemnations of Arius and Meletius are essential to that end; on the other regulations of the Council we shall dwell with extreme brevity.

S. Sylvester, then filling the Chair of Rome, sent two Priests, Vitus, otherwise called Viton, and Vincent, as his Legates to the Council; being unable, through his great age and infirmities, to be present in person. It thus fell to S. Alexander of Alexandria to preside: but he, doubtless, was unwilling to sit as judge where he was both the chief accuser and the principal witness. On this, the right of precedence devolved on S. Eustathius of Antioch; and he it was, in all probability, who did accordingly preside. It has often been asserted, that Hosius, as one of the Pope's Legates, filled that post: but it seems almost certain, that this venerable Prelate was not a Legate from Rome¹: and the arguments for

Legates
from Rome.

S. Eusta-
thius of
Antioch,
President.

¹ We wish to be as far as possible from being influenced, in a statement like the above, by any controversial view. The only authority for the Legantine office of Hosius is Gelasius; whereas for the fact of the legation of the Priests, we have the testimonies of Ensebius, Theodoret, and Sozomen. Again, S. Julius of Rome speaks of his Priests that had assisted at the Council, and had borne witness to the orthodoxy of Marcellus of Ancyra. Strange, had Hosius been legate, that

he should have been omitted!—And should it be replied, (we know not that it ever has been) that the fall of Hosius might have invalidated his testimony, we answer that Vincent, one of the Priests, was afterwards, in all probability, the famous Vincent of Capua: so that he should have been excluded for a similar reason. Baronius is forced, for lack of a better argument, to rely on the supposititious letter of the Nicene Fathers to S. Sylvester: a letter which, notwith-

his presidency, though strong, are not overpowering. That he was the life and soul of the Council, none denies; at the same time, it would be a painful reflection that the formal head of this great Synod had, at a later period, fallen away from the Faith of which he was then the principal support.

But if, in this august assembly, the numbers of the Catholics were far superior to those of their adversaries, the latter formed a well arranged phalanx, wanting neither courage nor art, strong in the favour of court parasites and eunuchs of the bedchamber, troubled with no scruples, and hesitating at no degradation. Of these, who numbered seventeen or eighteen, Eusebius of Nicomedia occupied the first place; Eusebius of Cæsarea the Ecclesiastical Historian, Paulinus of Tyre, Aetius of Lydda, the two excommunicated Libyan Bishops, Secundus and Theonas, possessed great influence; while Menophantus of Ephesus, as at that time next in rank to the See of Antioch, and Theognius, as Bishop of the city in which the Council were assembled, must have possessed an importance to which their talents and reputation do not seem to have entitled them.

Names of the
principal
Arian
Bishops :

opening of
the Council:

The Council was opened on the nineteenth day of June,¹ the Emperor being absent. For the first fortnight, the Bishops

standing the moderation of Tillemont's censure, is a gross, clumsy, and palpable forgery. But this is not all. The superscription of that letter is, Beatissimo Papæ—Hosius. . . . Macarius. . . . Victor [*i. e.* Vitus] et Vincentius. This would prove that, if Hosius were legate, S. Macarius was so too. Baronius omits his name; and this is also pointed out by Tillemont. The latter, with Launoy and others, considers the Legantine commission of Hosius as untenable.—But it is a different question, whether he were not President. The authorities for this seem to be: 1. The fact that in the signatures of the Nicene Fathers, and in Socrates, his name appears first. 2. That S. Athanasius calls him the head of all the Councils. 3. That he undoubtedly presided at Sardica. Here, however, the Bishop

of Antioch was not present, and he of Alexandria was a party in the cause. In favour of the presidency of S. Eustathius, we may observe, 1. That John of Antioch, (who ought to have had means of knowing,) writing to S. Proclus, calls him the first of the Nicene Fathers. 2. Facundus names him the first in the Council. 3. It would appear from Theodoret, that he was the Bishop who sat on the Emperor's right hand, and addressed him in the name of the Bishops. 4. Nicephorus entitles him Coryphæus of the Fathers of Nicæa. We confess that these latter arguments appear to us to prevail. (A great part of this note is from Tillemont, vi. 3. 675. & 920.)

¹ We are not concerned here to discuss this date. Conf. Pagi, Critice, 325. iii. & vii. Tillemont, vi. 3. 912: and Valesius, in Socrat.

held frequent meetings in the principal church of the city, for the purpose of hearing, from the mouth of Arius himself, the doctrines which had thus disturbed the peace of the Church. The heretic, standing as it were at bay, concealed nothing: he openly declared that the SON of GOD had been created from nothing: that He was capable of holiness and sin, and had, of His own free will, preferred holiness; and that, in the purest sense of the word, He was a creature and a work of the FATHER. At these blasphemies, the greater part of the Prelates stopped their ears; but the Eusebians were instant that the doctrine should be examined: if new, it might be supported; if strange, explained. The Confessors as loudly exclaimed that the ancient tradition should, without re-examination, be maintained and asserted.

In the midst of these disputes, Constantine, who had been celebrating at Nicomedia the anniversary of his first victory over Licinius, arrived at Nicæa. His entry was made on the eve of the day which had been appointed for the solemn session of the Council. Some of the Bishops, influenced probably by Arian wiles, repaired to the Emperor, and presented memorials on injustices alleged to have been committed by each other;—and Constantine, retaining them in his possession, promised to give them his attention.

The appointed day having arrived, the Fathers assembled in the great hall of the Palace, where seats had been arranged, correspondent with the number of the Prelates. They took their places, and waited in silence for the entry of the Emperor.

As many of the Bishops were little skilled in human learning, and entirely unacquainted with the rules of controversy, some learned men, as well Priests as Laics, were present to render their assistance.

The Emperor entered, in his robe of purple, studded with precious stones: his retinue consisted of a few unarmed Christians: the assembly rose as one man: Constantine blushed and, passing up the hall, stood before a little throne prepared for him at its higher end. The Bishops made signs to him to seat himself; and when he had done so, they all took their places. Eustathius of Antioch, who occupied the highest seat on the Emperor's right hand, then rose, and addressed the Council in

arrival of
Constantine:

he meets the
Fathers in
Session.

a short congratulatory speech¹ ; the Emperor replied by expressing his joy at meeting so large an assembly, and his hope that their deliberations would lead to unanimity. He spoke in Latin ; and an interpreter translated his words into Greek, which was the native language of the greater part of the Fathers.

The progress which was made in each of the sessions held after the arrival of Constantine is quite unknown to us ; and can only be discovered if researches in Oriental Monasteries should bring any contemporary history of the Council to light.

The first subject brought under consideration, was the heresy of Arius. The Catholic Bishops demanded of his supporters an account both of their principles, and of the reasons which had led them to embrace their present views ; the heretics, in endeavouring to answer, disagreed as much among themselves, as they did with the orthodox. The Emperor paid great attention to the arguments on both sides : he addressed the disputants in Greek, which he spoke with tolerable ease, moderating their eagerness, and endeavouring to his utmost ability to promote union. S. Athanasius, in all these disputes, signalized himself as the most powerful champion against the Eusebians ;—and thereby attracted that implacable hatred on their part, which ceased not to pursue him to the end of his days. Eusebius of Nicomedia, finding that if Arius were condemned, his own deposition might very possibly follow, applied himself to win Constantine through some of his Court favourites. The scheme failed, and the Bishop himself was exposed to the horror and indignation of the Council by the production of a letter in which he said, intending a *reductio ad absurdum*,—If it be asserted that JESUS CHRIST is Very and Uncreated SON of GOD, it is almost the same thing as asserting that He is Consubstantial with the FATHER. The letter was torn in pieces by the Council, in token of abhorrence.

Nor did Eusebius of Cæsarea fare better. He composed a Creed, which he endeavoured to pass off as the true sentiments of his party ; and which he affirms to have been received with applause by the Council, and merely rejected because it did not employ the Word Consubstantial. But this falsehood is worthy

Disputes
with the
Arian
Bishops :

Intrigues of
Eusebius of
Nicomedia :

¹ Conf. Bar. 325. lvi. Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 11. Theodoret, H. E. i. 6.

Tillemont, vi. 3. 920.

of its author. For the fact is, that it was rejected with disgust, as an attempt to condemn the grosser expressions, while it maintained the doctrine of Arius. This Creed ran as follows.¹ creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea :

“We believe in One GOD, the FATHER ALMIGHTY, Maker of all things, visible and invisible : And in One LORD JESUS CHRIST, the WORD of GOD, GOD of GOD, Light of Light, Life of Life, the Only Begotten SON, the First-Born of every creature : [begotten of the FATHER before all worlds, by Whom all things were made :²] Who for our salvation took flesh and had His conversation among men : and suffered and rose again the third day, and ascended to the FATHER ; and shall come again with glory to judge the quick and dead. And we believe in the HOLY GHOST. Believing that each of These are and subsist : the FATHER Very FATHER, the SON Very SON, the HOLY GHOST Very HOLY GHOST : as our LORD, sending forth His Disciples to preach, said, Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. Concerning which we also affirm that these things thus are, and that we thus believe, and have ever thus held, and will constantly remain in this faith till death, anathematising every godless heresy.”

It was therefore necessary to proceed to some more Catholic exposition of the Faith. its rejection:

The Fathers first advanced as the most simple proposition : “The WORD is GOD.” The Arians agreed ; so, they said, after a certain sort are all men : for it is written, All things are of GOD. To press the matter still more closely, the Council next asserted that the SON was the Virtue, the Wisdom, the Eternal Image of the FATHER : like Him in all things, immutable, eternally subsistent in Him. The Arians, by emphasising certain words of this statement, declared their willingness to subscribe to it. He is the *Image* of the FATHER : for it is written that man was made in His image : He is *in* Him : for it is written ; chicanery of the Eusebians :

¹ Theodoret, H. E. i. 12. We may remark that, in this section, where we are not writing of the immediate subject of our history, we have not thought it necessary to give a long list of quotations,—as well because the

facts are so universally known, as because we neither could add, nor could hope to add, any thing to what Baronius, Pagi, Tillemont, and Fleury have written on the subject.

² This clause is probably spurious.

in Him we live and move ; *eternally*, or always, in Him : for it is written, “for we which live are always” ; the Virtue and Power of GOD, for we are told of many such. The Fathers exclaimed, He is Very GOD. He is so, replied the Arians ; if He has been verily so made, verily He so is.

adoption of
the Homou-
sion:

Then the Council, purposing to leave no subterfuge, said :—The SON of GOD is CONSUBSTANTIAL with the FATHER. And here the Arians would not follow. They would not affirm that He is not only similar, but inseparable, not only like, but the same ; that that may be predicated of Him with respect to the FATHER, which can be predicated of no creature.

objections
of the
Eusebians :

And doubtless this word was the greater affliction to the Arians, because it was, as it were, a sword borrowed from their own armoury. If the SON be as the Catholics would have Him, they had said, He must be Consubstantial with the FATHER. He must be, the Fathers would seem to reply :—and so He is. Their opponents loudly clamoured against the term. One thing, they said, can be consubstantial to another only in three ways. Either by production, as a plant and its root : by procession, as a child and its father : by division, as the several pieces of a broken mass. The Catholics explained that the word was to be taken in a divine and heavenly sense, and not according to the gross meaning which the Arians put upon it. The next shift of the heretics was the assertion, that the term had been condemned in the Council of Antioch, holden against Paul of Samosata. For this very reason, replied the faithful, that it had been applied in a gross and earthly manner. Lastly, the Eusebians objected that it was not a Scriptural word. The orthodox answered, that neither were many terms employed by the Arians themselves ; and that the word (which, indeed, Eusebius himself confesses) had been employed by several of the most eminent Doctors of the Church. Paying, therefore, no attention to these representations, the Council proceeded to draw up a Symbol of Faith. It would appear that this task was entrusted to a committee, of which Hosius of Cordova acted as chairman ; it is certain that S. Athanasius also had a hand in it, and we probably shall not err, in imagining S. Alexander, who had written so much and so well on the subject, and who is known to have had so much authority in the Synod, to have been one of its

have inscribed an iota in the *homöusion* so as to term the Son of GOD *Æquisubstantial*, instead of *Consubstantial*: Eusebius moreover declaring, that he subscribed the Creed but not the anathema. Secundus and Theonas alone had courage and honesty to stand firm in their sentiments. The Council condemned them with Arius, and together with them, Euzoius and Pistus, who were afterwards respectively intruded by the heretical faction, into the thrones of Antioch and Alexandria. They, as well as the heresiarch, were banished by the decree of the Emperor, into the province of Illyria. Here, though deposed, they persisted, it would seem, in exercising Episcopal functions; at least we find that Pope S. Julius refused ordination conferred by Secundus as invalid.

Decision
respecting
the Meletian
schism.

S. Alexander next brought before the Fathers the schism of Meletius:—and it is difficult to account for the lenity with which the Council treated its originator. Perhaps it was feared that harshness might induce the Meletians to throw themselves unreservedly unto the party of the Arians, with whom they had already formed a connexion; perhaps Alexander himself was not unwilling, having been compelled to proceed with the greatest vigour against the Arians, and thereby having incurred the imputation of acting from personal motives, to shew, in a point where moderation might more safely be employed, that he was willing to sacrifice all things for the sake of peace, truth alone excepted. Another reason has been suggested in the excessive eagerness of Constantine himself to compose differences. However this may be, Meletius was received to Communion, and permitted to retain the title of Bishop: while he was forbidden for the future to exercise any episcopal functions, and another Prelate was given to the Church of Lycopolis, if indeed, a Catholic had not been ordained there previously. As to those whom he had consecrated, they were to be received into the Church by imposition of hands, and to continue in that rank, to which he had elevated them: though they were to yield precedence to such as had been canonically ordained by Alexander. In case of the death of any of those Prelates who had remained in

bius from a charge of inconsistency and vacillation. A much easier method might surely have been found to

effect this end;—and the stratagem is quite in keeping with the character of Eusebius.

the Communion of the Church, his place might be supplied by one of those who had been consecrated by Meletius, at the choice of the people, and by the confirmation of the Bishop of Alexandria. To prevent the possibility of any collusion, Meletius was ordered to present a list of those whom he had elevated to any ecclesiastical office. On his return to Alexandria, he complied with the injunction : and gave in the names of twenty-eight Bishops,¹ besides eight Priests or Deacons.

The event, as we shall see, proved the lenity of the Council to have been much misplaced ; and the terms in which S. Athanasius speaks of it, prove clearly his opinion of the ill-judged character of the measure.

Thus far is the Council of Nicæa intimately connected with the welfare of the Alexandrian Church. With its decision of the question about Easter, we are no further concerned than to remark, that it was now made the office of the Bishop of Alexandria to give notice of the true day to his brother of Rome, and by his means, to the whole Catholic Church.

Of the twenty celebrated Canons of Nicæa, one only concerns the Church of Alexandria. The Sixth Canon provides for the observation of the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis ; confirming to the Bishop of Alexandria his right of alone ordaining Bishops in those provinces. But we must not omit mention of the manner in which S. Paphnutius, the Egyptian Bishop of whom we have before spoken, distinguished himself in the debate on the eelibacy of the clergy. In the consideration of the Third Canon, which forbade the clergy to retain the practice prevalent in some places, of having women, known by the title of *subintroduced*, to manage their domestic affairs, and limiting those who might dwell in the same house, to mothers, aunts, or sisters, some of the Fathers were desirous of ordaining that any Clerk married before his ordination must after it observe continence. S. Paphnutius opposed this, and as he himself was unmarried, and of notoriously pure life, his opinion had great weight. "The Church had advanced," he said, "that none could marry after the reception of Holy Orders : let that suffice ; to press the matter further would rather tend to immorality than

The Paschal question.

S. Paphnutius.

¹ The names are preserved by S. Apol. i. 789. (Ed. Paris. 1627.)
Athanasius, Ad Imperator Constant.

to chastity. S. Paul had declared that marriage was honourable in all ; and the liberty received from our fathers should be left to our posterity." This opinion prevailed.

The synodal letter of the Nicene Council, recapitulating its proceedings, was addressed to the Churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, in the first place, and in them to all Catholic Churches. The principal Bishops were ordered to make known the decrees of the Council to the Prelates in their various countries ; so that while the news of the triumph of the Faith was propagated by Osius to Spain, France, and Britain, it was at the same time announced by means of John, Bishop of Persia, to the Faithful as far as Malabar and the borders of China.

The Council was terminated on the twenty-fifth of August ; on which day Constantine gave a banquet to the Bishops, in honour of its conclusion, and of the commencement of the twentieth year of his reign, having deferred the latter ceremony for a month, that the two might coincide. Eusebius of Cæsarea pronounced a panegyric on Constantine : and the feast which followed was one that might become such guests on such an occasion. The Emperor dismissed the Prelates with magnificent presents, and earnest exhortations to peace and unity.

The Eastern Church commemorates the Fathers of Nicæa ; the Western Church has not followed its example.

Arabic Canons of Nicæa : their authority.

We must now say something on those Ecclesiastical laws, commonly known by the name of the Arabic Canons of Nicæa,¹ and considered by the Eastern Church authoritative. Isidore Mercator is the first Western author who mentions them ; and he appears never to have seen them, merely saying that he had heard of other Canons of Nicæa in the Eastern Church, which were of considerable length, and superior in size to the four Gospels. The Crusaders seem to have known nothing of them : nor were they accessible to Europeans till edited as genuine in the seventeenth century. Now, while on the one hand, it is absurd to receive them as the work of the Nicene Fathers, as the Orientals do, and as even some members² of the Roman Church have done, affirming that they took three years to compose, it is

¹ Renaudot, pp. 73, 74.

² As for example, Turrianus and Abraham Echellensis.

equally wrong to call them false and supposititious, and to esteem them utterly valueless. For all the Oriental Churches, as well Orthodox as Nestorian and Jacobite, are agreed in receiving them, and have done so for more than a thousand years; and they are even held good in law, in those cases where by a special privilege of the Sultans or the Caliphs, the Patriarchs or the Bishops are allowed to act as temporal judges. They are, in fact, an Arabic version of the whole body of the ancient Ecclesiastical Canons, attributed by mistake to the Council of Nicæa. And this was not an uncommon error. So we find Pope S. Innocent quoting, by mistake, a Canon of Sardica for one of Nicæa, in his controversy with the African Bishops respecting the right of appeal to Rome. That there was such a collection of Canons is evident from many writers, but more especially from Photius. They were first received by the Eastern Catholics, and from them borrowed by the Jacobites and Nestorians, as one simple fact proves. The forty-third Canon is merely a repetition of the last of the Council of Ephesus, the fifty-third of the second of Chalcedon. The Nestorians, therefore, had they known its origin, would not have received the former, nor the Jacobites the latter. The compilation was probably made shortly after the rise of the Mahometan Empire, and it consists of three parts. The first contains, in differing MSS., 80, 83, or 84 Canons; the second comprises 33 or 34; the third, entitled the Canons of the Emperors, embraces a variety of extracts from the Digests, Novels, and Constitutions of the later Emperors. And it is remarkable, that though some of these Emperors are, of course, by the Nestorians and Jacobites accounted heretical, those laws were by all the differing sects, as well as by the Catholic Church in the East, considered authoritative.

It is hardly worth while to note the extraordinary traditions¹ of certain Jacobite writers concerning the 2048 Bishops, whom they affirm to have met at Nicæa; of whom, they say, 318 only maintained the Consubstantiality of the Sox. Yet these wild

*Oriental
accounts of
the Council.*

¹ Makrizi's account, 115,—136, where he makes the Fathers of Nicæa to have been split up into every possible kind of belief, and to have at

length submitted to the Emperor, and the 318 that sided with him, is equally extravagant and amusing.

fables, adopted from Mahometan authors, have actually been appealed to by a Socinian author of the seventeenth century, in defence of the blasphemies of that sect.

The first employment of S. Alexander, on his return to Egypt,¹ was to compose the Meletian schism. Meletius, after having given in the required catalogue of his ecclesiastics, retired to Lycopolis, where, as some will have it, he ended his days in the Unity of the Church. But some of his followers were more obstinate; and the Bishop of Alexandria found himself chiefly thwarted by three persons: John Arcaph,² Bishop of Memphis, Callinicus of Pelusium, and Paphnutius, an anchorite, who had obtained an excellent reputation for piety among his own partisans. These men betook themselves to Byzantium, intending to prefer a petition to the Emperor that they might be allowed to hold separate assemblies, on account, as they protested, of the harshness of Alexander.³ But Constantine, probably irritated at the ill-success of his conciliatory measures, would not so much as see them. They still, however, followed the Court: until, at Nicomedia, Eusebius, glad of any opportunity to harass his great opponent, espoused their cause, and presented them to the Emperor. But the interview procured them nothing beyond the reproaches of Constantine.⁴ These attempts, however, induced Alexander to despatch Athanasius to Court: and the latter, acquainted with the declining health of his Bishop,⁵ and foreseeing that the Church of Alexandria had already set its eyes on himself, was not unwilling to charge himself with the embassy, and thus to escape from the honour of the Episcopate.

Continu-
ance of the
Meletian
schism.

¹ He does not seem to have left Nicæa immediately. For the Coptic and Ethiopic Calendars celebrate the three hundred and eighteen Fathers on November 5: not improbably, as Sollerius remarks, p. 38 A., the day of the publication of its letters to the Church of Alexandria.

² At least it seems probable, as Baronius observes, 332. i., that the John who had been named by Meletius, as Sozomen asserts, the chief of his party, (though this seems fatally subversive of the report that Meletius died a Catho-

lic,) but who, at all events, was a leading man among the Meletians, was the same with John Arcaph, of whom we shall have more to tell hereafter.

³ S. Epiphan. Hær. 68.

⁴ Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 23.

⁵ This seems the best way of reconciling the account of S. Epiphanius, that Athanasius was sent to Court by Alexander, with that of Sozomen, that he retired of his own accord into some obscure retreat. That he also did this, on his return from Constantine, is certain.

Five months after the Council, Alexander was seized with a mortal disease. As his clergy stood around him, he called for Athanasius. One of the same name, probably he who had signed the condemnation of Arius together with his more celebrated namesake, stepped forward, but the dying Prelate took no notice of him, and thus shewed that it was another to whom he referred. In a few moments he again called for Athanasius, and repeated his name several times: when no one replied, "Athanasius," said he, "you think to save yourself by flight, but flight will not avail you." And shortly afterwards, this "loud voiced preacher of the Faith,"—so Theodoret calls him—was gathered to his fathers, after an Episcopate of fourteen years.

S. Alexander
names S.
Athanasius
his succe-
sor.

and dies
Feb. 26,
326.*

A comparison naturally suggests itself between Dionysius and Alexander, the most illustrious among the Antenicene Bishops of Alexandria, as Athanasius and Cyril were among those who subsequently filled that throne. That in learning, talent, power, and influence with the Church at large, Alexander was inferior to Dionysius, none can deny: at the same time, if he defended the truth less powerfully, he also never gave a handle to a charge of heresy, except from heretics. Both eminently possessed a mild and conciliating spirit: but in Dionysius it was tempered by firmness and decision, in Alexander it sometimes seems almost to have degenerated into irresolution. The former, under God, relied entirely on his own resources in dealing with enemies; the latter evidently depended on those of his greater deacon. Finally, if Dionysius had the honour of confessing CHRIST in two persecutions, it may be doubted if the

Comparison
of S. Diony-
sius with S.
Alexander.

* The day of S. Alexander's death is not certain. S. Athanasius tells us that he died less than five months after the Council: *οὕτω γὰρ πέντε μῆνες παρήλθον, καὶ ὁ μὲν μακαρίτης Ἀλέξανδρος τετελεύτηκεν.* Apolog. ii. (i. 777 n.) The Chronicon Orientale, however, fixes his decease on Monday, April 17:—which would mark the year as 327. The Chronicon Alexandrinum also names Monday, but makes the day to have been the 18th. This would seem to

render that day very probable: but this involves an insuperable difficulty, which we shall notice in its place, concerning the Episcopate of S. Athanasius. On the whole, the day given by the Roman Martyrology, February 26th, seems as likely as any other. Strangely enough, S. Alexander is not commemorated in the Menology; in the Ethiopie or Coptic Calendars he is named on Ap. 17.

real sufferings that Alexander underwent for His name were not the greater ; if the weariness and harassing nature of his Epistles to all parts of the Church, the bitter opposition he received from enemies, the lukewarm support afforded him by friends, did not more than counterbalance the exile of Valorri, and the plague and famine at Alexandria.¹

SECTION XVII.

CONVERSION OF ETHIOPIA.

S. Athanasius the Apostolic, Patr. XX. A.D., 326. A.M., 42.

To write the life of S. Athanasius, as it ought to be written, is to write during the period when he flourished, the history of the whole Catholic Church. It is plain that our limits must confine us to a concise sketch of his actions and his sufferings : for we are less concerned with him in this work, as the great champion whom it pleased God to raise up in defence of the Faith, than as the persecuted, and finally triumphant, Bishop of Alexandria.

It is said by Rufinus, and the story has been repeated by Sozomen,² that he had been early attached to the service of the Church, and that from the following occurrence. Alexander happening, on the feast of S. Peter the Martyr, to look from a window of his house towards the sea-shore, saw him, in company with other children of his own age, amusing himself by a game, in which one of them personated the Bishop, the rest his congregation : Athanasius supported the former character. Alexander

¹ Makrizi, § 138, has a singular story about Alexander, which is not confirmed by Eutychius. There was a solemn Feast of Saturn at Alexandria, on the 12th day of Hetur (= Nov. 6.) This he persuaded the people to change into a Festival in honour of S. Michael, retaining most of the ancient ceremonial. The Temple itself was dedicated under the invocation of the Archangel, and stood till it was destroyed, in the 358th year of the Hegira, by the sol-

diers of Alimam-al-moez-ledin-Allah-ibn-Tamim Mad.

² The great difficulty of this account is the question of dates. As S. Peter suffered November 26, 311, the earliest period at which the event could be fixed would be the same day in the following year. We can hardly allow S. Athanasius to have then been more than twelve years old. And yet, in this case, he would have been conse-

sent some of his ecclesiastics, whom he was about that day to entertain at dinner, to stop the game, and from their and his own interrogatories, he learnt that Athanasius had already baptized several of his play-fellows in the sea. Alexander, the above named historians further affirm, considered this Baptism valid, and thenceforth, pleased with the bearing of the young Athanasius, took him under his especial protection, and in process of time made him his Archdeacon. But the story is, to say the least, very doubtful.

The dying words of Alexander had left no doubt that he recommended Athanasius as his successor: and his wishes met with general acquiescence. As the Deacon, however, was still absent, the Meletians intruded a creature of their own named Theonas,¹ into the vacant See; but he died at the end of three months; and when S. Athanasius returned, and was forced from the retirement to which his modesty had caused him to retreat, he was pointed out by popular clamour for the Evangelical Throne. A large number of Prelates from different parts of Egypt were assembled for the purpose of giving a successor to Alexander, when the shouts of the multitude hardly seemed to allow them a choice. "Give us Athanasius! the true Christian, the ascetic, the true Bishop! We will have none but Athanasius! The Prelates shall not depart till they have elected Athanasius!"² Glad to comply at once with their own judgment, the late Bishop's recommendation, and the popular clamour, the Fathers pronounced Athanasius to be him on whom their votes had fallen.

An important accession was made in the beginning of the Episcopate of the new Bishop, to the territorial extent of the Church of Alexandria.³ A philosopher named Meropius undertook a

crated at the age of six-and-twenty,—a circumstance which must have been brought forward against him by some of his opponents. And the whole tale seems to involve a time of settled and continued peace: which a year after the death of S. Peter could hardly have been. If this difficulty could be solved, or if it can be thought not absolutely fatal to the story, there seems no other reason for rejecting it.

¹ S. Epiphan. *Hær.* 68. And see the Benedictine Editors' *Life*, 326. ii.

² S. Athanas. *Apol. cont. Arian.* 6.

³ Rufinus, i. 9. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 19. Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 23. Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. 23. It is plain, therefore, that Procopius is in error, when he says, (*Lib. i. de Bello Pers.*) that the Ethiopians, or, as he calls them Axumites, were not converted till the time of Justinian.

journey into Ethiopia, partly with the view of satisfying his curiosity, partly with the desire of enriching himself by the productions of that country: and he was accompanied by two young relations, Edesius and Frumentius. On his return, the vessel foundered in a part of the Red Sea, and the men were, as the barbarous custom of the Ethiopians then was, cut to pieces on making their escape. The two youths were alone spared, and being presented for slaves to the king of the country, became, from their good temper and talents, favourites at court. Frumentius in particular, was made secretary to the king, who dying not long after, left his queen and two young children, Abreha and Atzbeha, unprotected. The former besought the two Christians not to take advantage of the liberty to which the Monarch on his death-bed had restored them, but to assist her in managing the affairs of the kingdom, until her sons should attain a riper age. Frumentius, thus invested, as the more able of the two, with the character of Regent, endeavoured by all the means in his power to propagate the knowledge of Christianity: he invited foreign merchants to open a traffic with Abyssinia, and gave both the sites and the materials for the erection of churches. Thus the Faith made great progress during the term of his government; and he gave in a faithful account of his expenditure and proceedings when the young princes were considered of sufficient age to administer themselves the affairs of state. The queen and her sons would gladly have longer availed themselves of the service of their former captives, but they were bent on leaving Abyssinia. Edesius repaired to Tyre, his native place; but Frumentius, whose heart was more in the work, hastened to Alexandria, and recounted to S. Athanasius the whole series of events. A Council of Bishops was sitting at the time; and the Archbishop, on their recommendation that a Prelate should be appointed for Abyssinia, looked on Frumentius and said, in the words of Pharaoh to Joseph, "Can we find such an one as this is, a man in whom the SPIRIT of GOD is?" He therefore consecrated him first Bishop of Axum, and recommended him to the Grace of GOD in returning to the scene of his labours.

It is a question of as much difficulty as interest, to determine the condition of the Ethiopians, at the time of the mission of

Frumentius. That this people has always retained a strong partiality for Jewish rites, is an undoubted fact :—the practice of circumcision has never been dropped. The only question is, how far the Ethiopic tradition of the origin of this disposition has any foundation whatever in truth.

The Queen of Sheba, who came to Jerusalem, attracted by the wisdom of Solomon, is by Ethiopic writers affirmed to have reigned over their own country.¹ They name her Makeda; and report that, on her return, she became, by Solomon, the mother of a son, whom she named Menilchee, but who was by his father, under whom he received his education, called David. On attaining to manhood this prince was accompanied by several of the Jewish nobility to his own country;—and from him descended the line of Salomonæan kings. In the time of Bazen, the twenty-fourth of these monarchs, our Lord was born: and thirteen of his successors wielded the Ethiopic sceptre before the arrival of Frumentius. When he returned with Episcopal jurisdiction, Abreha and Atzbeha were still joint monarchs: and for their docility in profiting by the instructions of the Missionary, and their zeal in propagating the Faith, they were added, by their grateful people, to the catalogue of the Saints.² There seems no reason for believing that the Gospel had been previously preached in Ethiopia; or, if it had been, that it ever took root.

¹ It would be hopeless to enter into the dispute as to what country is really intended by Sheba. The question is discussed, but not satisfactorily, by Ludolf, *Hist. Ethiop.* ii. 3.; and by Tellez, *Tratado do que fizeram os Padres da Companhia de Jesus* i., 25. In favour of the claims of Ethiopia are Origen and S. Augustine: of those of Arabia, Justin, S. Cyprian, S. Epiphanius, S. Cyril of Alexandria; and, among the moderns, Baronius, Soarez, and most ably of all, Pineda. In behalf of the former it may be urged that, though the rite of circumcision may have been introduced in a different manner, and varies from that of the Jews, inasmuch as both sexes are subjected to it, still the universal tra-

dition, the sacred dances, the royal motto,—“The Lion of the tribe of Judah hath conquered,” the mystical ark, the intercourse between the Jews and Ethiopians, evinced, for instance, by the journey of the Eunuch of Candace to Jerusalem, do seem to point in that direction.

² This Festival is on the fourth of Baba (= October 1). Frumentius is commemorated on the eighteenth of Chiahac (= December 14), on the twenty-sixth of Abib (= July 20), and on the twenty-third of Tot (= Sept. 20). By the Ethiopians he is generally named Salama, but also Fremonatos: and from him the Town of Fremona takes its name.

The Church founded by S. Frumentius,¹ Apostle of Abyssinia, exists, though in a miserably degraded and heretical state, at this day : and it may not be improper to say a few words with respect to its constitution, in reference to the Mother Church of Alexandria.² The Bishop of Axum is often called Patriarch of Ethiopia, but this title is wrongly applied : his proper jurisdiction is that of a Metropolitan, but there are some peculiar limits to his power. He is never a native of Ethiopia, but an Egyptian : his nomination and consecration rests with the Bishop of Alexandria alone ; and he has the right of consecrating Bishops, so that the whole number in his province do not exceed seven.³ This, as the event proved, was a most unwise regulation ; it was apparently adopted at first by the jealousy of Alexandria, lest Axum should constitute itself a Patriarchate. As twelve Bishops were canonically required for the consecration of a Patriarch, the limitation to seven entirely obviated this danger ; but it has caused two great evils ; it has prevented the spread of the Gospel in Africa, and has been the occasion of the heresy of the Abyssinian Church. Two years must necessarily elapse before a vacancy can be supplied, because of the length of the journey, and the period required by the new Metropolitan for acquainting himself with

¹ There is a difficulty as to the date of the Mission of S. Frumentius. Meropius is said to have travelled in imitation of the philosopher Metrodorus. But Metrodorus could not have returned before 324 ; because he found Constantine at Byzantium, in which place the Emperor could not be, till master of the East. Some persons have, therefore, thrown the ordination of Frumentius as late as 335, to give time, after 324, for the voyage and death of Meropius, and the tutelage of the young princes by his pupil. On the contrary, all ecclesiastical historians affirm the consecration of Frumentius to have taken place at the very beginning of the Episcopate of Athanasius. Without having recourse to the hypothesis of a double journey of Metrodorus, it is enough to suppose that Meropius did not wait for the return of

that traveller, but followed him soon after his departure.

² Renaudot, Dissert. Singular. de Patriarch. Alex. § cviii.

³ The forty-second of the Arabic Canons of Nicæa forbids the Ethiopians to ordain themselves a Patriarch : or that any one of their own doctors should be appointed to the office : "because they are under the power of the Patriarch of Alexandria, whose duty it is to appoint over them a *Catholic*, who is inferior to the Patriarch." We learn from the kindness of a Coptic Priest at Alexandria, that the various ecclesiastical dignities are thus expressed :—the Patriarch by the number 7 ; the Catholic or Metran of Abyssinia, by 6 ; an Ordinary Bishop, by 5 ; a Priest, by 4 ; a Deacon, by 3 ; a Sub-Deacon, by 2 ; a Reader, by 1.

the Ethiopic and Amharic; the former the language employed in the offices of the Church, the latter that commonly spoken. No dues or offerings are expected by the See of Alexandria from Ethiopia, but it is usual on the death of the Metropolitan that the king and nobles should accompany their letters requesting the consecration of his successor, with suitable presents. In an Œcumenical Council, the Metropolitan of Axum would claim the twelfth place.

The neighbouring Church of Nubia, the origin of which is involved in great obscurity, is not subject to the See of Axum. It depends entirely on Alexandria: from which it not only receives its Metropolitan but also all its Bishops.

SECTION XVIII.

ATHANASIUS FALSELY ACCUSED CONCERNING ISCHYRAS AND ARSENIUS.

THE Meletians, by their artifices and restlessness, continuing to excite disturbances throughout the Diocese of Alexandria, and having now so completely cast in their lot with the Arians, that the names were used almost promiscuously, Athanasius resolved on a visitation of the Thebais, where these schismatics principally abounded. He embarked on the Nile, and pursued his course as far as Syene,¹ the boundary of Egypt and the Diocese of Ethiopia. As he was passing Tabennesis, Pachomius, to whom his piety, his age, and his miracles assigned the first place among the ascetics of those parts, came forth to meet him with a large band of monks. Serapion, Bishop of Tentyra,² would have pointed him out to Athanasius, and recommended him for the priesthood: but the humility of Pachomius induced him to hide himself in the throng, until the Bishop's vessel had passed by. Then he as-

S. Athanasius visits his Diocese.

¹ Vit. S. Pachomii, Bolland. May 14.

² Tentyra is also called Tentyris, and by the Arabians, Dendera. Sera-

pion is also named Saprion, and Aprion, and is by some supposed the same with Aprianus, who was at the Council of Sardica.

sured the by-standers that it had been revealed to him how Athanasius was ordained a great light of the Church, and should suffer many things for the Name of CHRIST.

A.D. 328.
efforts of
Eusebius in
Asia.

Eusebius and Theognius had, for communicating with the Arians, been banished by Constantine, but they now found means to return to their Sees, and to appease the anger of the Emperor. Having ejected Amphion and Chrestus, the legitimate Prelates of Nicomedia and Nicæa, they were at leisure to bend all their efforts for the re-establishment of Arius, who had already returned from exile, at Alexandria. They then accomplished the overthrow of Eustathius of Antioch, on a false charge of adultery; and next endeavoured to intrude Eusebius the historian into the vacant chair. The people flew to arms; and, as the multitude were almost equally divided, the consequences might have been serious, had not the civil power promptly interfered. Eusebius, however, though he was the deadly enemy of the Homoûsion, had no mind to become a confessor for his creed: and one or two Arians of less note were successively intruded into the See. Asclepas of Gaza, and Eutropius of Hadrianople next fell before the wiles of the heretics, and a way was thus, it was hoped, made clear for the return of Arius. Arrangements having been made with the Meletians for the furtherance of the scheme, Eusebius wrote to Athanasius, urging him, in the gentlest language he could employ, to receive Arius to his Communion. At the same time, the messenger who carried the epistle, had it in charge to add menaces to persuasions. Athanasius disregarded both equally: Eusebius, undiscouraged, wrote a second time to the same effect, and persuaded Constantine to dispatch an angry mandate for the reception of Arius. But these efforts were, for the present, in vain: Athanasius persuaded the Emperor to acquiesce in his view, and clearly proved that union between himself and his excommunicated Priest was impossible.

he writes to
Athanasius.

On this, the Eusebians, who had probably thought that the greatest opposition would come from Asia, and from the elder Prelates, found that though in the Diocese of Antioch they were carrying matters with a high hand, they could only attain the summit of their wishes by the overthrow of Athanasius. The Meletians were apprised that the time for action had arrived.

They were at a loss for some time to discover a specious subject of accusation; at length they dispatched three of their leading men, Ision, Eudæmon, and Callineus, who appear to have been in the number of the Bishops consecrated by Meletius, to Nicomedia, for the purpose of bringing a charge before Constantine, to the effect that Athanasius had imposed on the Egyptians an unaccustomed tribute of linen vestments for the Church of Alexandria. Providentially, two Priests of Athanasius's, Apis and Macarius, Athanasius accused by the Meletians, A.D. 331, were then at Court; and by them the falsehood of the accusation was made clearly manifest. Constantine, in a letter to Alexandria, condemned the attempt, and requested S. Athanasius to visit him. The Prelate obeyed, and was received with great honour. and acquitted.

Eusebius had been prudent enough to retain the Meletian envoys: and they now, at his instigation, brought forward two new accusations. The one was, that the Bishop of Alexandria had sent a chest of gold to Philumenus, an aspirant to the purple, of whom we have no other account; the other, which attained far greater celebrity, was the famous history of Ischyrras, and the broken Chalice. On this we must dwell at length.¹

In the Mareotis, which formed the proper Diocese of Alexandria, was a hamlet called the Peace of Sacontarurum, the size of which did not enable it to maintain a separate Church and Priest. Ischyrras, a man of notoriously bad character, who had received pretended orders from Coluthus, as we have mentioned above, thrust himself into the charge of this place, and hesitated not to perform the most sacred offices of the Church. Not more than seven persons formed his Communion; and his own father and mother remained firm Catholics. Informed by the Priest, within whose parish the Peace lay, of these scandalous proceedings, Athanasius despatched that Macarius, whom we have just named as his vindicator, to summon Ischyrras before him. The Priest went; but as the offender was confined to his bed by illness, he left a message for him with his father, charging him to abstain from his sacrilegious attempt, and to intrude himself no more on the ministry of the Church. Ischyrras on his recovery found himself unable to maintain the shadow of authority

¹ S. Athanas. Apol. adv. Arian ii. (I. 781.)

he had hitherto exercised, and joined himself to the Meletians. Under their auspices, a tale was invented for the purpose of ruining Macarius, and blackening the character of the Bishop by whom he was employed and trusted. Macarius, it was said, arrived at Sacontarurum, at the moment when Ischyras was at the Sacrifice: he threw down the altar, burnt the sacred books, broke the chalice; and (as tales never lose by repetition,) some affirmed that he had overthrown the church. The story refuted itself. There never had been a church at Sacontarurum: Ischyras had employed for that purpose the house of an orphan named Ision; there never had been a Priest, and therefore never any sacred vessels; it was not on Sunday that Macarius visited the place, and therefore (the inference is remarkable) the Communion could not have been in course of celebration. Constantine, who heard these accusations in a suburb of Nicomedia, recognized this falsehood, and honourably dismissed Athanasius, furnishing him with a letter to the Præfect of Alexandria, in which the conduct of the Meletians was exposed, and the Faithful were encouraged.

Ischyras
confesses.

Ischyras, who had been led by pique and the influence of others to propagate his calumny, now came to Athanasius, confessed his crime, and with tears besought admission to the Communion of the Church.¹ Athanasius called together the Parish Priests of the Mareotis, with some Deacons, partly of that province, partly of Alexandria, and in their presence Ischyras gave a written statement that what he had asserted was false, and that he had been compelled to yield to the ill treatment of the Meletian Bishops, Isaac of Cleopatris,² Isaac of Latopolis,³ Heraclides of Nicius. This document was attested by the Priests and Deacons who were present: but it was not thought right to admit one who had been involved in two schisms to immediate Communion. And the event proved the prudence of the measure, for Ischyras re-

¹ Apolog. ad Constant. Imp. i. 781, D.

² It was a city near Arsinoë, and in Egyptus Prima: and this is the first occasion that we hear of it as a Bishopric. It is now called Sersene, and was long the seat of a Jacobite Prelate.

³ This is to be distinguished from the city of the same name in Egyptus Prima, and derived its name from the Latus, a fish described by Athenæus, vii. 17. It also, under the name of Asna, was long a Jacobite See.

mained attached to the party of the Meletians. It appears that notwithstanding the retraction of Ischyrras himself, his partisans persisted in declaring his charge well-founded, and even invented additional circumstances, for the purpose of throwing still greater odium on the Patriarch.

As, however, his deposition or banishment was in no way advanced by these efforts, John Arcaph, the acknowledged leader of the Meletians, bethought himself of another method of attack.¹ Pretended murder of Arsenius ; Arsenius, Bishop of Hypsele, one of the same party, was persuaded, on the receipt of a sum of money, to retire into seclusion ; and the Meletian faction instantly gave out that he had been murdered by Athanasius. To give the better colour to their words, they invested their complaints with all the pathos and eloquence that they could command. "At least," said they, "if you have removed him from the world, deny us not the poor consolation of paying a last tribute to his remains. Restore us his body ; it is all that we can now ask, or that you can bestow. You can no longer dread him as an enemy : if you did violence to him in life, it is the part of a foe to respect the ashes of a departed opponent." They carried about a dried hand in a box, which they affirmed to be that of the Bishop ; and to have been severed by Athanasius for magical purposes.

When some degree of odium had been excited against the perpetrator of so foul a deed, they sent the hand to the Emperor, demanding vengeance on Athanasius. Constantine wrote to his brother Dalmatius,² committing the inquiry to him. The latter summoned the accused and the accusers before him. Athanasius had hitherto despised the accusation : but he now discovered that it would be necessary to provide himself with a sufficient defence. He therefore wrote to the Egyptian Bishops, requesting them to examine into the matter, and to discover whether Arsenius were dead,—and if so, to procure authentic information as to the time and manner of his decease,—or A.D. 332. it is exposed. alive, and in this case, where concealed. A Deacon was charged by the Archbishop with the commission : and he pursued his

¹ Apol. ad Constant. I. 782 D. Theodoret, H. E. i. 28. Socrat. H. E. i. 27. Rufin. i. 15.

² Apol. ubi supra. This Dalmatius is said by Socrates to have been the

nephew of Constantine. But the Chronicon Alexandrinum asserts that he was his brother. The younger Dalmatius was now at Narbonne, attending the lectures of Exuperius.

researches to so good effect, as to discover that the Bishop asserted to have been murdered was resident at the monastery of Ptemencyrcis, in the Thebais. To Ptemencyrcis he accordingly went; but Arsenius was no longer there; he had been sent by Pinnes, the superior of the monastery, into Lower Egypt. The Deacon seized on Pinnes and brought him to Alexandria: and the officer there commanding the troops discovered, in a judicial examination, that Arsenius had in truth been concealed at Ptemencyrcis, in order to give a handle for the accusation of S. Athanasius. Pinnes then wrote a letter to John Arcaph, then at Antioch, and pressing the charge before Dalmatius, and advised him to withdraw the accusation of murder, since all Egypt knew that Arsenius was alive. This letter fortunately fell into the hands of Athanasius.¹ Still, the subject of the imposture was not yet arrested. Diligent inquiry had discovered that he had been at Alexandria, and was now at Tyre; and at Tyre accordingly he was seized. He then resolutely denied himself to be Arsenius; but Paul, Bishop of Tyre, convicted him of falsehood. The partial detection of this atrocious scheme confounded the Meletians; and John their leader, and Arsenius himself, requested to be re-admitted into the Communion of the Church, promising all canonical obedience for the future to the See of Alexandria.² Undaunted by the ill success of his former plots, Eusebius had, at the early part of 333, exerted his influence with the Emperor to obtain the Convocation of a Council: and in March, Constantine summoned one to be holden at Cæsarea. At this assembly, which did not meet till long after it was convoked, little was done, and Athanasius and his Bishops refused to be present at it. Thenceforward Eusebius conceived that hatred of the Egyptian Church which never afterwards forsook him.

Council of
Cæsarea,*
August, 334.

While Athanasius was consoled and refreshed by a visit from S. Antony, which, not to disturb the course of our history, we shall relate at a more convenient time, Constantine was persuaded to convoke another Council at Tyre, judging that Athanasius might possibly suspect Eusebius of Cæsarea, of harbouring personal ill will against him: while Paul of Tyre was open to no such charge.

¹ It is preserved by him, Apol. ii. 3.

² Socrates (H. E. i. 29,) makes this event to have happened during a session

of the Council of Tyre: but the testimony of Athanasius himself is a far safer guide.

* Page. 334, ii.

Sixty¹ Bishops, for the most part Arians, were present, and Constantine was the more glad of their meeting at this conjuncture, because he had just completed a large and magnificent church at Jerusalem, and wished its dedication to be solemnized by a numerous concourse of Prelates. S. Athanasius, for a considerable space of time, refused to be present, knowing that the President, Placillus, Bishop of Antioch, was one of his great enemies; and that the Count Flavius Dionysius, sent under pretence of maintaining order, would be very willing to employ the secular arm against him. The unhappy Macarius was dragged before the Council, loaded with irons; and Athanasius was warned that, if he did not appear of his own accord, force would be employed in his case also. On this intimation he went, taking with him forty-nine Egyptian Bishops, and among them the celebrated Paphnutius, whom we have before mentioned. Potammon, another holy confessor, was also in the number.

Council of Tyre.

On their arrival at Tyre, Athanasius was not allowed to take his seat among the Bishops, but was treated as a criminal.² "What!" cried Potammon, addressing Eusebius of Cæsarea, and bursting into tears; "What! you too among the judges of Athanasius? You and I were in prison together during the persecution: I lost an eye in confessing CHRIST: how you escaped unharmed, let your conscience tell." "What!" cried Paphnutius to the Bishop of Jerusalem; "who would have expected to find Maximus among these men? Did we not each of us suffer mutilation for our LORD? and is one of us now to occupy the seat of the scornful?" Maximus, who had been deceived by misrepresentations, was then instructed in the real nature of the Arian charges; and to the end he continued firm in the communion of Athanasius. Eusebius, on the contrary, instantly rose: "Judge," he said, "holy Fathers, what would be the insolence of these Egyptians, were they our judges, who thus insult us when theirs!"

S. Athanasius arrives.

¹ Tillemont (viii. 59,) argues very plausibly against this number given by Soerates, (i. 28,) because of the difficulty of conceiving that S. Athanasius with fifty Bishops, should have been so unjustly condemned by sixty, of

whom all were not Arians. We may perhaps imagine that the first session was attended by sixty Prelates: or that this number was more especially summoned by the Emperor.

² S. Epiphan. Hær. lxxviii. 7. (1721. D.)

The Catholics, at the outset, excepted against thirteen¹ of the assembled Bishops as judges, on account of their violent and undisguised hostility to Athanasius: but no regard was paid to their remonstrances.

The Catholics protest.

Calumny respecting the ordination of S. Athanasius.

The first accusation brought forward was that concerning Ischyrras and the broken chalice;—but that, having been satisfactorily answered, was for the present dismissed, to make way for the following charge²: that at the death of S. Alexander there had been a considerable difference of opinion as to the choice of a successor, and with respect to the Arian controversy; that the Bishops of Egypt had bound themselves by oath not to ordain to the vacant see, till these differences were adjusted; that notwithstanding, seven Prelates had in a clandestine manner consecrated Athanasius; that the latter, finding many averse from his communion, committed great violence, especially at the Feast of Easter; and that many of the Faithful at Alexandria viewed their Bishop with such sentiments of abhorrence, as to abstain from worshipping in his Church. S. Athanasius replied, that to give these charges a shadow of truth, they should have been attested by at least one of the hundred Bishops over whom he presided; and satisfactorily proved that he had been elected by the unanimous voice of the people, and consecrated by an unusually large number of Bishops.

S. Athanasius accused of fornication:

The Arians, in the mean time, were busy in inventing new calumnies against S. Athanasius. He was accused of having violated a virgin consecrated to God,³ and of having given her

¹ They were, 1. Eusebius of Nicomedia. 2. Eusebius of Cæsarea. 3. Narcissus of Neronias. 4. Theognius of Nicæa. 5. Maris of Chalcedon. 6. Theodore of Heraclea. 7. Macedonius of Mopsuestia. 8. Ursacius of Singidon. 9. Valens of Mursa. 10. Patrophilus of Scythopolis. 11. Theophilus, of whom nothing is known, and who is believed by some to have been the same with Theodore. 12. Placillus of Antioch. 13. George of Laodicea.

² Sozomen, H. E. ii. 17. And see the very probable arrangement of the events of the Council, given by the Benedictine Editors, 335, 15.

³ Rufin. i. 17. Sozomen, ii. 25. But it must be confessed that, whatever Tillemont says to the contrary, this story wants confirmation. It is never mentioned by S. Athanasius himself: nor does it appear to have been brought forward at any of the Councils assembled in his favour: though a more striking proof of the malice of the Eusebians could hardly be found. In short, it has much the appearance of a Catholic fabrication, designed to make up for the unjust condemnation, on similar grounds, of S. Eustathius.

money to bribe her silence. The woman was brought forward in the midst of the Council, and with many signs of grief repeated her story. Athanasius had concerted his defence with Timothy, one of his priests; and when the tale of the woman was finished, sat still, as if merely a spectator. Timothy, on the contrary, replied, "You affirm then that I have been guilty of violating your honour?" "I do," replied the woman, pointing him out with her finger, and adding the details of time and place. Those of the Bishops who were impartial spectators, could not refrain from laughing: Eusebius and his faction were covered with confusion, and drove the accuser from the place, in spite of the request of S. Athanasius that she might be arrested, for the purpose of discovering the author of the calumny.

The Arians, furious at their repeated failures, now came to that charge which was the most heinous, and which they thought the best capable of proof, as not thinking that the discovery of Arsenius before mentioned was capable of proof before the Synod. They brought forward the severed hand of Arsenius, affirming that he had been murdered by the Archbishop of Alexandria. A murmur of horror passed through the Council: when it was hushed, S. Athanasius rose, and demanded if any of the Bishops then present had been acquainted with Arsenius. Many replied in the affirmative. He then sent to his own house, and in a short time a man, muffled from head to foot, was introduced into the hall where the Council were assembled. "Look well," cried S. Athanasius, uncovering his face, "and see if this be not that Arsenius whom I am reported to have murdered." The Bishops were astonished: those ignorant of the plot because they really believed Arsenius to be dead; those implicated in it, because they thought him at a distance. Athanasius, pursuing his advantage, exhibited first one hand, then the other, of his supposed victim; thus completely exposing the groundlessness and malice of the plot. The rage of the Eusebians at this discovery was so great, that had it not been for the prompt interference of the secular authorities, S. Athanasius would have been torn in pieces.¹

They were not, however, to be so baffled. The Council, recurring to the first charge, decided that the treatment of Ischyrras could not so well be judged at a distance from the spot, and appointed a

¹ Theodoret, H. E. ii. 30.

Commission
of Inquiry
in the
Mareotis :

deputation to visit Mareotis for the purpose of gaining such information as personal examination might enable them to furnish. Six of the most determined enemies of S. Athanasius, Macedonius, Maris, Theodorus, Theognius, Ursacius, and Valens, to whom Theodoret adds Narcissus, were appointed commissioners ; and the Meletians had already dispatched four of their own body into Egypt, to smooth the way, and to pack evidence. The Egyptian Bishops protested in writing against the whole procedure. Alexander of Thessalonica, who possessed influence with Flavius Dionysius, addressed a letter to him of the same tenor,—and, as it at first seemed, with some effect. The Prelates attached to the True Faith did the same thing ; but the faction of Eusebius prevailed, and the deputation set forth with a letter of recommendation to the Prefect of Egypt, and a cohort of soldiers for their safeguard. It is true that the Count cannot be charged with injustice on this score ; for, on the complaint of Athanasius and his friends, who were afraid that an iniquitous choice would be made, he wrote to the Council, urging all fairness, and reminding them that truth, not condemnation, was the object of the inquiry. But, by referring the selection to a Committee, the Eusebians contrived to choose the commission as we have stated.

On this the Egyptian Bishops, to the number of forty-nine, drew up a memorial to Dionysius, pointing out the visible injustice of the late proceeding, and calling on him to put a stop to it. They also applied to Alexander of Thessalonica, one of the oldest Prelates in the Church ; and he, who possessed great influence with the Count, addressed a letter to him in behalf of Athanasius, which the latter has preserved. Dionysius again interfered by a letter to the Commission : but no attention was paid, and probably he did not wish that any should be paid, to his remonstrance. Thus convinced that no justice could be expected at Tyre, the Bishops signed an Act of Protest, and, it would seem, also appealed to the Emperor.

In Egypt, however, things went on very differently. The deputies found a most willing coadjutor in Philagrius, the prefect, who, being an apostate from the Faith, and a man of bad character, bore a particular hatred to S. Athanasius ; he not only gave the commissioners all the assistance in his power, but himself accompanied them into Mareotis. Arrived there, they

evidently shewed that they had already prejudged the cause. They lodged at the house of Ischyrras; the tendency of the inquiry all was one way: and they would not allow copies to be taken of the testimony. The Priests and Deacons of Alexandria drew up a firm but moderate protest; they stated that Macarius ought to have been brought into Egypt, as his accuser was there; they claimed the right of themselves being present at the inquiry, and called all impartial persons to witness that the refusal of this claim rendered the whole conduct of the commission in a high degree suspicious.

their palpable injustice.

The Clergy of Alexandria

The Priests and Deacons of Marcotis protested in a similar manner. Ischyrras, they said, had never been a priest; he had never possessed a church; complaints had never been made against S. Athanasius by any Catholic; they themselves had claimed to be present in the course of the investigation, and had been refused. The former paper was signed by sixteen Priests¹ and five Deacons; the latter by fifteen of each. So that here, in the immediate vicinity of Alexandria, were fifty-one of the Catholic clergy bearing testimony in favour of their Bishop: and not one who in any way appealed against him, or brought forward any statement prejudicial to his character. Jews, Catechumens, and Pagans, were openly admitted and encouraged to give evidence: the most palpable discrepancies were overlooked, as when some of the Catechumens professed themselves to have been present at the irruption of Macarius, while Ischyrras all along declared that when the Chalice had been broken, he had already commenced the Sacrifice: if so, the Catechumens would of course have departed. To these facts, however, the Commissioners paid no sort of heed. On their return to Alexandria, they openly persecuted the Catholics, and encouraged the heathen soldiery to every kind of insult against them, more especially against the Consecrated Virgins.

and Marcotis protest.

Violences at Alexandria.

On arriving at Tyre, they gave in their report²: and S. Athanasius being no longer there, (for he had thought it necessary to his safety to hasten to Constantinople,) sentence of deposition was pronounced against him. John the Meletian and his

S. Athanasius deposed.

¹ Among the Priests, the name of person whom we have twice had occasion to notice.

² Sozomen, H. E. ii., 25

party were received into Communion ; Ischyra was raised to the Episcopate¹ ; and a grant obtained from the public treasury to rebuild the church which Athanasius was asserted to have demolished. The village thus, contrary to the Canons, erected into a See, was as we have said so small, that it never had up to that time possessed even a parish church.

The Bishops were about to receive Arius into their Communion, when a message was received from the Emperor, commanding them to hasten to Jerusalem, where the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was now complete. Athanasius, in the mean time, remained at Constantinople, where the Bishop, Alexander, was a pillar of the orthodox doctrine. After the solemnities of the dedication, the Council of Tyre was continued, and Arius, on giving in a new, but equally unsound, profession of his Faith, was received into the Communion of the Church.

S. Athana-
at Constan-
tinople :

The Emperor returned to Constantinople, and on entering the city, was astonished by the appearance of Athanasius,¹ who threw himself at his feet, recounting the injustice which he had suffered, and praying for protection. Constantine did not at first recognize him, and was for some time unwilling to have any communication with a man whom he regarded as justly condemned by a Council. Athanasius called God to judge between himself and his accusers, whom he adjured the Emperor to set face to face before him, and Constantine yielded. The Bishops, yet sitting in Council of Jerusalem, were summoned to Constantinople. The messengers who bore the summons, found them about to condemn Marcellus of Ancyra, a partizan of Athanasius, and who though, as appeared afterwards, unsound in doctrine, was for a long time considered by the Catholics, chiefly on the strength of his vigorous opposition to the Arians, perfectly orthodox.

The Council was thus a second time broken up : and although the Emperor's letters desired the attendance of all the Bishops then in Jerusalem, the Eusebians played their part so well, that six only were sent as deputies, and these six were the most powerful enemies of Athanasius, three of them having been also employed as commissioners to the Mareotis.

his accusers
arrive there ;

On their arrival at Constantinople, they dropped all their

¹ Apolog. § 85.

² Apolog. §. 86.

former calumnies against Athanasius, but adopted a new charge, which they considered likely to touch the Emperor more nearly. They affirmed that the subject of their hatred had, by his influence with the people of Alexandria, obstructed the supplies of corn which that city was in the habit of furnishing to Constantinople. Constantine, who was tenderly jealous of the greatness of his own foundation, and who knew that without the granary of Alexandria it could not subsist, burst forth into fury: it was in vain that Athanasius denied the calumny; Eusebius of Nicomedia pressed the charge, and Constantine too easily believed him. Indeed, on a similar accusation, this impotent prince, whom the adulation of the Eusebians represented as the chief pillar of the Church, had ordered the philosopher Sopater, an intimate friend of his own, to execution.¹ Taking credit to himself for his clemency, he banished Athanasius to Treves in Gaul.² Thus after a struggle of ten years, this holy Confessor was given over to the will of his enemies. He generously, in his writings, excuses the Emperor: the exile, he says, was rather intended to remove him to a place of safety, than as a punishment. And indeed Constantine shewed his suspicion of the Arian faction by refusing to fill the see of Alexandria with the candidates whom they wished to intrude.

he is banished.

Five of his Bishops stood by S. Athanasius in the hour of his need; and four Priests, his most active supporters in Egypt, were also subjected to the same sentence of exile.

SECTION XIX.

FIRST EXILE OF S. ATHANASIUS.

ATHANASIUS was received with great honour, both by S. Maximin, Bishop of Treves, and by Constantine the younger,³ who had the

A. D. 336.
February.

¹ Eunap. Vit. Philosoph. ap. Baron. 336, X.

² Sozomen, indeed, says, that the affair of Ischyra was the cause of S. Athanasius's exile. (ii. 28, p. 79, c. n.)

But the testimony of Athanasius himself is express, that not a syllable was said at Constantinople on this topic.

³ Apolog. § 9.

S. Athanasius at Treves.

chief command in the Gauls, and resided in the city which was its then capital. Shortly after his arrival, the news of the Council of Constantinople under the presidency, it would seem, of Placillus of Antioch, reached him with all its remarkable consequences. Marcellus of Ancyra was deposed, how justly it is impossible to say, on a charge of Sabellianism; the work which laid him open to this accusation was one on that passage of S. Paul, "Then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him That put all things under Him": the reply to it, by Eusebius of Cæsarea, is still extant. With this intelligence, Athanasius also received other tidings of greater importance. Wrought on by the Eusebians, the Emperor allowed Arius to be received into the Church; his faction desired S. Alexander of Constantinople, then more than ninety years old, to do so: he refused; they threatened him with deposition if he would not comply: he persisted; they by the mouth of Constantine named a certain day on which Arius should be received; the city was in consternation; arguments and entreaties were bootless; by the advice of S. James of Nisibis, then present, the Catholics discontinued them, and had recourse to prayer alone; the Friday night was spent by Alexander in earnest supplications that God would stretch forth his right arm; the morning dawned; the triumph of the Arians seemed complete; Arius was led in procession round the city; S. Alexander still persevered in prayer; the day was wearing away; the Catholics began to despair; at three in the afternoon, Arius, then in the square of Constantine, was struck by the Hand of God, and gave up the ghost; the Catholics crowded the churches to return thanks for their deliverance; many Arians were converted; and the place of the archheretic's death was long held accursed.

Death of Arius.

The Alexandrians petition for the return of S. Athanasius.

In the meantime, the people of Alexandria were not idle. They were earnest in their supplications to God that He would open the Emperor's eyes, and to Constantine himself they addressed a memorial, praying him to recall their Bishop. S. Antony himself wrote again and again to the same effect; but Constantine, now drawing near the end of his days, turned a deaf ear to all petitions. He upbraided the Alexandrians with folly, in desiring the return of an ambitious and turbulent Pre-

¹ Apolog. §. 87.

late; he commanded the Priests and Consecrated Virgins to concern themselves no more in the affair, and professed his fixed determination to abide by his resolve. To S. Antony he represented the probability that the few who attached themselves conscientiously to the party of Athanasius might be mistaken through ignorance or party feeling: while it was not to be supposed that the decision of the many pious Bishops who had condemned him could err through the one, or be influenced by the other. At the same time, as John Arcaph was intriguing at Alexandria, Constantine, in spite of all the efforts of the Eusebians, banished him also.

Shortly after came tidings of the baptism of Constantine, who had till then deferred that Sacrament, by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and his subsequent death. He is reckoned by the Greek Church among the Saints; the Latin Church has judged more soberly and reasonably in denying him the title, although reckoning him in a certain sense one of the greatest benefactors that the Faithful have ever known.

Death of
Constantine.

In spite of all the efforts of Eusebius, the dying Emperor gave strict commands for the recall of Athanasius; and, it is said, reiterated these injunctions in his will. But, whatever might be the reason, the exiled Prelate did not, or could not, at once avail himself of this permission. It is a tradition at Treves, that he principally dwelt in a cavern, which is still shewn, and is in the precincts of the late abbey of S. Maximin; and that, in this place, he composed the Hymn *Quicumque Vult*. The last part of this assertion is undoubtedly false; the former is probable enough.

The division of the empire followed:—Constantine, the friend of S. Athanasius, had all the territory beyond the Alps; Constantius, Egypt and the East; Constans, Italy, Illyria, and Africa. From the share of Constantius must be subtracted Armenia and Cappadocia; from that of Constantine, Achaia and Macedonia, which had before been apportioned to Hannibalianus and Dalmatius. These, however, having been murdered by the soldiers, not, it is said, without the instigation or connivance of Constantius, these provinces were annexed by the respective emperors to their own shares.

Constantius was soon gained by the Arians; and Eusebius of

A D. 338.

Nicomedia resolved, by the Emperor's authority, to fill the See of Alexandria with a partizan of that heresy. Constantine however prevented this occurrence by determining to send
 June 17, 338. Athanasius to his own Church : a resolution which he well knew Constantius would not venture to oppose. He therefore addressed a letter to the Faithful of Alexandria, in which he exhorted them to receive their Prelate with joy, as a true preacher of the Law of CHRIST ; and menaced his calumniators with the severest punishment. Athanasius accompanied Constantine into Pannonia, whither he went to confer with his brothers on the division of the empire, and had an interview with Constantius at Viminacium, a city of Mœsia. He here procured the recall of many other Catholic Bishops, and even ventured so far on the indulgence of Pope S. Julius, as to expel several Arian Prelates who had intruded themselves into the Sees of the cities through which he passed. After a short stay at Constantinople he proceeded into Cappadocia, and had a second interview with Constantius at Cæsarea ; and so, in the autumn, he arrived at
 Return of S. Athanasius. Alexandria. The burst of exultation with which he was received is reported to have exceeded the usual demonstrations with which the Emperor himself was wont to be welcomed.

The return of S. Athanasius, though doubtless in itself most justifiable, nevertheless gave a greater handle to his enemies than any other action of his life. By a Council, they said, he had been deposed ; by a Council therefore he ought to have been restored. But their complaints were drowned in the burst of joy which greeted the passage of the exiled Bishop through Syria to Egypt. Marcellus of Ancyra, still held to be a Catholic, and probably erring rather in words than in meaning, took the same opportunity of returning to his See.

A.D. 340.

Full of indignation at the return of Athanasius, the Eusebians invented another calumny against him. Constantine, after the Council of Nicæa, had by public ordinance decreed that in every city a certain quantity of corn should be set apart for the ecclesiastics, the widows, and the Consecrated Virgins ; and more especially for the Sacrifice, in places where, as in Libya, the soil did not produce corn. This portion, freely distributed by Athanasius, was affirmed by his enemies to have been disposed of by him to his own advantage. This charge

was in vain denied, and the Arians then drew up a memorial to the three Emperors, embodying this with other accusations. They obtained, however, neither his death nor his banishment, evidently as they longed for either; but Constantius was weak enough to credit the charge with respect to the corn, and wrote a letter to the Prelate upbraiding him with avarice. Many of the Egyptian Bishops came forward with an attestation of his innocence: and thus this accusation fell to the ground. A.D. 329.

The Eusebians, who had already, by the unjust deposition of S. Paul of Constantinople, seated their patron on that throne, now assembled in considerable force at Antioch, and pretending that the See of Alexandria was vacant, proceeded to fill it with that Pistus whose deposition we have already mentioned. That the deposed Priest might not want a suitable consecrator, Secundus, Ex-Bishop of Ptolemais, took upon himself that office. It does not appear that the civil power gave any encouragement to this monstrous act; and it was by God's good Providence attended with happy effects. It was desirable to obtain the recognition of Pistus by the Roman See: to this end his friends dispatched a Priest and two Deacons to Rome, who carried with them the information that had been collected in the Mareotis. Julius forwarded them to Athanasius, and he dispatched his own legates to Rome. The Arian deputies, who expected nothing less, were thrown into consternation; Macarius, though sick, left the city by night; the Deacons Martyrius and Hesychius, who, with greater effrontery, stood to their charges, were covered with confusion.

The same legates were charged with another important document. The Bishops of Egypt, whether at the suggestion of Athanasius, or from their feeling that to allow him to bear alone the brunt of the storm was, so far as in them lay, to betray the truth, met in Council at Alexandria to the number of nearly one hundred; and addressed a synodal epistle to all Catholic Prelates, which S. Athanasius has preserved. In it they set forth the entire innocence of Athanasius, the gross and impudent falsehoods of his adversaries, the preposterous conduct of Eusebius who, himself guilty of the greatest violations of the Canons, ventured to upbraid the Bishop of Alexandria with his pseudo-deposition at Tyre; and

Pistus
consecrated
by the
Arians
Bishop of
Alexandria.

Council of
Alexandria.

conclude with the information that the Eusebians had now thrown off the mask, were making common cause with the pure Arians, and were openly communicating with them in Egypt.

On the receipt of these missives, Julius resolved on convoking a Council, where the point in question might be decided. To this the deputies of S. Athanasius willingly assented, while those of the Arians could not venture directly to decline the proposal.

Athanasius himself went to Rome, where also a memorial arrived to Pope Julius, signed by sixty-three Bishops of Asia, Phrygia, and Isauria, in his favour. But whether or not the Pontiff ever had proceeded so far as actually to separate Athanasius from his Communion, certain it is, that he regarded him with some suspicion: and perhaps justly, but not generously, endeavoured to bear himself as an impartial judge between two contending parties.

S. Athanasius at Rome.

Athanasius waited at Rome during eighteen months, in the vain hope that his adversaries would bring their formal charge against him, and that the matter would come to a trial. The Council was fixed for the middle of the year 341, and the Eusebians were invited to attend. In the meantime, Bishops from all parts of the Church, among whom Marcellus of Ancyra was the most eminent, continued to arrive in Rome, in hopes of their obtaining that justice which their Arian persecutors had denied them. The Eusebians were compelled to declare that in their opinion no Council was necessary; the event shewed how much reliance was to be placed on their words.

Council of Antioch.

Constantine had been, in the preceding year, murdered by the troops of his brother, Constans; so that Constantius was at liberty to follow his own pleasure regarding Athanasius. Ten years previously the elder Constantine had commenced a church of rare magnificence at Antioch; and his son had now completed it. The Eusebians gladly took advantage of the solemnity of the dedication to assemble a Council of ninety-seven Bishops;—and the Synod of Antioch is one of the most famous in Ecclesiastical History. With its three Creeds, none of them Arian, and yet none fully Catholic, we have nothing to do; we are here concerned with its treatment of S. Athanasius alone. Among the twenty-five Canons which under its name have been received by all the Church, two, though not in themselves objectionable,

were evidently intended by the Eusebians as fatal weapons against Athanasius.

The Fourth Canon provided, that if a Bishop deposed by a Council, or a Priest or Deacon deprived by his Bishop, presumed to exercise his office, he should not be capable of restoration even in another Council. The twelfth Canon ordered that if a Bishop or Priest, under the like circumstances, should appeal to the Emperor, his punishment should be the same.

It is easy to see that Athanasius had laid himself open to the penalty pronounced in both cases. Constantius was at Antioch, assisting at the Synod, and the Arian portion of the Council importuned him to allow the Canons to be put in force against the Bishop of Alexandria, dwelling on their old as well as their later calumnies against him. The Emperor did not, or would not, see the flagrant injustice of an *ex post facto* application of Canons, and consented.

The next difficulty of the Arians was to choose another Bishop for Alexandria. Eusebius of Emissa, a learned Prelate, and voluminous author, though afterwards suspected of Sabellianism, was first proposed, but he declined the dignity. Gregory of Cappadocia was then brought forward. He had spent much of his time at Alexandria, had been kindly treated by Athanasius, and had requited his benevolence by becoming one of his calumniators. This ordination was entirely contrary to the Canons; and, fearing great opposition at Alexandria, the Eusebians obtained an escort from the Emperor for the new Bishop, and the re-appointment of Philagrius (who had before distinguished himself in the inquiry with respect to Ischyra), as Prefect of Egypt.

Gregory and his followers arrived at Alexandria towards the end of Lent; and the excesses which they committed are beyond description. The imperial edict, treating Athanasius as deposed, and his successor as the orthodox Bishop, was published by Philagrius the Apostate: young men of debauched lives, Jews, and Pagans, were encouraged to attack the Catholic churches, to wound the monks, to insult the virgins, and even to kill some of the worshippers. Heathen sacrifices were offered on the altar of the church of Quirinus; in its baptistery such enormities were committed as cannot be mentioned. On Good Friday,

Gregory
consecrated
Bishop of
Alexandria :

he enters
Alexandria

his
outrages.

Athanasius
again sails
for Rome.

Gregory and Philagrius entered another church, and, as a punishment for the horror everywhere evinced at their horrible proceedings, caused thirty-four persons, as well married women and virgins, as men of high family, to be publicly scourged. Athanasius, whom the affairs of his Church had again called to Alexandria, finding that his presence only increased the disturbance, while he was utterly unable to render any assistance to the Catholics, embarked for Rome.¹

On Easter Day, Gregory threw many Catholics into prison, and attacked several churches. He drew up a series of charges against Athanasius, signed, for the most part, by Pagans, and filled with such enormities as to deserve no punishment short of death.

Persecution
in Egypt.

Gregory not only possessed himself of all the churches, but forbade, under severe penalties, the private assemblies of the Catholics. The dying departed without the viaticum; children remained unbaptized: better this, said the Faithful, than recognize the ministrations of the blasphemers of our LORD. Complaints were made in vain to Constantinople; no letters were allowed to pass. Gregory soon after began his visitation of Egypt: he pursued the same course wherever he went; Bishops were treated with the same barbarity which had been exercised towards the Priests of Alexandria. Potammon, the illustrious Confessor, whom we have already mentioned, and one of the Three Hundred and Eighteen, was beaten so cruelly as to occasion, shortly after, his death; and the Church reckons him among the Martyrs.

SECTION XX.

EGYPTIAN MONASTICISM.

It is refreshing to turn from these bloody scenes to the quiet life of S. Antony. At the age of ninety, he was tempted to consider himself the most perfect of all the Monks. That night it was revealed to him that he had overrated his attainments, there being a hermit who had made greater advances in holiness,

¹ S. Athanas. Epist. Encyc. 2, 3.

whom he was exhorted to visit. Three days' journey brought him to the cell of S. Paul, the first hermit, then in the ninetieth year of his solitary life. They knew each other at once, though they had never before met: and the raven that had brought half a loaf daily for the supply of Paul's wants, on that day came charged with a double portion. S. Paul knew by revelation that the hour of his departure was at hand; after sharing his repast with his guest, and spending the night in prayers and psalms, willing to spare S. Antony the pain of witnessing his death, he requested him to fetch him a mantle which S. Athanasius had bestowed on him. Antony returned with speed to his monastery for the purpose of bringing it: on coming back again, he beheld in a vision the soul of S. Paul carried by Angels into Heaven. Hastening onward to the cell, he found the corpse of the hermit in an attitude of prayer, and bitterly lamented that he had known so late one whom he had lost so soon.

S. Antony
visits
S. Paul:

death of the
latter.

Antony, as we have said, had already paid a visit to Alexandria during the Pontificate of S. Athanasius. The occasion is related thus:—His disciples observed him in an ecstasy, which, after lasting about an hour, passed off. He threw himself on his knees, and prayed long and fervently, shedding at the same time abundance of tears. When he arose, he warned his hearers to prepare for a severe persecution of the Church. "I have seen," said he, "in a vision, an altar surrounded by mules, who were employed in kicking at and overturning it: and I heard a voice which said, 'My Altar shall be profaned.' Notwithstanding, my children, be not discouraged;—the Catholic Faith will in the end be victorious, and Arianism must be cast out. Only stand fast in the Faith, and resist the doctrine, not of Apostles, but devils.¹"

Of S. Antony's disciples, we have already mentioned the Macarii. S. Paul the Simple held also a distinguished place among that holy fellowship. He was a poor countryman, who, till the age of sixty, had served God in the married state. The vices of his wife induced him to quit the world; and he took an eight days' journey into the desert, for the purpose of being received as the disciple of Antony. The latter rejected him, observing that he was too old for the monastic life; and that he

Disciples of
S. Antony:
S. Paul the
Simple:

¹ S. Athanas. Vit. S. Anton. xviii. 105. Bolland. Jan. 2, p. 137.

had better return and serve God in the state to which he had been called. The fervour of the candidate induced him to remain three days without food at the door of the Hermit; and Antony, won by his importunity and earnestness, at length admitted him his disciple. After a long and rigorous practice of obedience, he placed him in a cell at three miles' distance from his own; and was accustomed to regard him as the holiest among his followers. Paul had the gift of miracles in a far more eminent degree than his great master; and to him, accordingly, S. Antony was in the habit of sending such sick or possessed persons as he himself was unable to cure. He had departed to his LORD some time before the period at which we have now arrived.¹

Circ. A.D.
330.

S. Hilarion: S. Hilarion, again, was one of the most successful imitators of S. Antony. Born at Gaza of heathen parents, he was sent to Alexandria for instruction. While there he received the illumination of Baptism, and at once changed a life of dissipation for one of penance. After a visit to S. Antony in the desert, he conceived the idea of following the same life in his own country; and to this end, at the age of fifteen, he took up his abode in a desert on the Asiatic border of Egypt. He here, though naturally of weak constitution, passed a life of singular austerity: but twenty years elapsed before he was known or followed. Then he was privileged to work his first miracle; and soon became the most celebrated of all monks for his supernatural gifts. From that time his disciples increased rapidly, and, as the Father of the Monks of Palestine, he enjoyed little solitude from the concourse of those who came to visit, to consult, or to be cured. On the death of S. Antony,—for we will anticipate the course of history,—he resolved to retire into greater privacy; and though opposed by the inhabitants of the neighbouring country, who assembled to the number, it is said, of ten thousand, to resist his determination, he went into Egypt for the purpose of visiting the monastery of Antony. At Aphroditopolis, he obtained the requisite information from Barsanes, a Deacon, who let dromedaries for those who wished to visit Mount Pisper; and, after three days' journey through a fearful desert, he was received by the disciples and attendants of

A.D. 307.

¹ Pallad. Laus. xxviii.

Antony, Isaac and Pelusius. By them he was conducted over the various places which had been hallowed by their Master. Hence he retired to a desert near Aphroditopolis, and was soon regarded by the Egyptians as him on whom the mantle of Antony had fallen. Distressed at the honour he received, he went first to Alexandria, and thence retired to the desert of the Oasis. His reputation still following him, after a year spent there, he sailed to Sicily, and took up his abode near Pachynus. For a similar reason he left this retreat also, going first to Epidaurus, and then to Cyprus, where, after five years' residence, he gave up the ghost with great calmness. "Go forth," he said, "my spirit; what hast thou to fear? Threescore and ten years hast thou served CHRIST, and dost thou dread death?" The well-attested miracles of S. Hilarion are more astonishing and more numerous than those of any other Father, with the single exception of S. Gregory the Wonder-worker.¹

Less celebrated than Hilarion, and yet a worthy follower, though not disciple, of Antony, was S. Isidore. He was the spiritual director of many in the great desert of Scete; and to the end of a long life persisted in the severest manual labour. He was principally remarkable for the gift of tears,—both that he had sinned so much, and that he fell so far short of Antony and Pambo.²

For Pambo also was one of the great Fathers of the desert; and was to the Wilderness of Cells,—as that inhospitable tract of country was called,—what Antony was to the desert of Pisper. Here, eighty miles beyond Mount Nitria, in a solitude where travellers directed their course, as in the high seas, by sun and stars, he laid the foundation of that wonderful brotherhood, of which we shall hereafter have to tell more largely. Of him the story is related, that towards the beginning of his course, he applied to another holy anchorite for spiritual direction. The hermit began to recite the thirty-ninth Psalm:—"I said, I will take heed to my ways, that I offend not with my tongue." "Stay," said Pambo, "that is enough: let me retire to my cell to practise it." In the seventy-first year of his age, he fell asleep in the Lord, as he was engaged in his usual occupation of basket making.³

S. Isidore of
Scete:

Circ. A.D.
390.

A.D. 385.

¹ S. Hieron. in Vitâ.

² Coteler. i. 487.

³ Pallad. Laus. 117.

We can perhaps hardly calculate the prodigious influence which this noble army of anchorets must have exercised on the affairs of the Egyptian Church. The supernatural austerities of all, the wonder-working powers of many, the impossibility of influencing them by hope or by fear, and the physical security in which their solitude placed them, rendered them a barrier which Arianism in vain endeavoured to assault. If, in after times, when little remained of their original institution, except its austerities, they were powerful enough to lead nearly the whole Church of Alexandria into heresy, can we doubt that under God, and next to S. Athanasius, they were the means, at this epoch, of preserving it unshaken in the profession of the Catholic Faith?

SECTION XXI.

SECOND EXILE AND RETURN OF S. ATHANASIUS.

ON leaving Alexandria,¹ S. Athanasius appears to have remained for some little time uncertain whither he should direct his course. He lay concealed near the city for a few days:² and employed himself in the composition of his encyclic Epistle to all Catholic Bishops throughout the world; in which he stated the proceedings of Gregory at length, and shewed that, as the danger was common to all prelates, so the defence should be undertaken by all in common. He then sailed to Rome, apparently after the conclusion of the Paschal solemnities, Easter having this year fallen on the nineteenth of April.

S. Athanasius again visits Rome. A.D. 341, May.

Pope Julius received Athanasius in the most cordial manner; and again despatched legates to the Eusebians, requiring them to send a deputation without loss of time, for the purpose of making good their charge against the Bishop of Alexandria.³

¹ We have assumed the double visit of S. Athanasius to Rome as proved by the very able note of Tillemont (viii. 1133) in opposition to the objec-

tions of Valesius, and the Benedictine Editors.

² Epist. Encyclic. ii.

³ Apolog. cont. Arian. xx.

In the mean time, through the exertions of the two companions of Athanasius, during both this and his former visit to Rome, the monastic system was becoming known and followed in that city. Ammonius and Isidore, for such were the names of these monks, were noted for their holiness of life, and contempt of the world; Ammonius carried the latter quality to such an excess as to refuse, when in Rome, to view any of the public buildings or other spectacles of interest, except the basilic of S. Peter.¹

In due time, Pope Julius received the answer of the Eusebians, still in Council at Antioch, to his summons. It recognized, in general terms, the Primacy of the See of Rome, but excused the Prelates from attending the proposed Synod in that city, on the grounds of distance, shortness of time, and the Persian war. Julius for some time kept the letter by him, hoping that the Orientals would change their mind; but finding no likelihood of such an event, he convoked the long intended Council. Fifty Bishops assembled in the church of which Viton, the same who had been legate at Nicæa, was parish priest.² After a careful examination of the causes of Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and S. Paul of Constantinople, the Synod acquitted all; and Julius announced the fact in a Synodal letter to the Fathers of Antioch. He severely rebuked them for their injustice, violence, and false excuses for non-attendance: and concluded his epistle by an assertion of the privileges of his See, and by reminding his brethren of the terrible account that they must one day render to God for all their works.

That account had, when the legates arrived at Antioch, been already given in by Eusebius of Constantinople. But Julius, finding that those who now were at the head of the Eusebian faction, paid little attention to the Epistle of the Council of Rome, addressed himself to Constans, the firm friend of the banished Bishop. On his remonstrance to Constantius, Narcissus, Maris, Theodore, and Mark of Arethusa, in Syria, were ordered to wait on the Emperor of the West, and to vindicate the proceedings of the Council of Antioch. This they failed in doing: S. Maximin of Treves abstained from their communion,

Negociations with the Eusebians.

Circ. Octob. A.D. 342.

¹ Sozomen, H. E. iii. 7.

² Apol. x.

and a breach seemed on the point of breaking out between the East and West.

Sketch of
the progress
of Arianism.
A.D. 345.

A second Council at Antioch produced a Confession of Faith, called *Macrostichus*, on account of its length ; it was not heretical, but was declined by the Western Council of Milan, at which S. Athanasius was present ; the Fathers declaring their preference for the Creed of Nicæa. It was now plain that an Œcumenical Council would be the only remedy for the distracted state of the Church ; and by the consent of the two Augusti, it was summoned at Sardica, on the confines of the two empires.

A.D. 346.

About one hundred and seventy Bishops met : but to relate at length their proceedings would be beyond our purpose. The Western Bishops, about a hundred in number, remained at Sardica, Hosius of Cordova presiding ; acquitted Athanasius and Marcellus, and excommunicated the heads of the Eusebian party.

A.D. 347.

The Eastern Bishops retired to Philippopolis : and there, to the number of seventy-three, at the head of whom was Stephen of Antioch, excommunicated Julius, Hosius, Athanasius, Paul of Constantinople, and all their adherents. Thus the East and West were thrown into a state of open schism.

In the mean time the persecutions continued at Alexandria. Public notice was given that if S. Athanasius or his companions returned, it should be lawful for any one to bring them to condign punishment. A second Council of Milan prevailed on Constans to send an embassy to his brother, requesting the return of S. Athanasius, in compliance with the Council of Sardica. Constantius, however, found some pretext for evading the escape of the exiled Bishop, till the murder of Gregory by the Alexandrians, who naturally hated him, left him without the shadow of an excuse. Finding that the result of his longer refusal would be a civil war, he determined to do with a good grace that which must at all events be done ; and the letter which he wrote on the occasion to Athanasius, was by no means wanting in fair professions or obliging offers. Athanasius was at first undecided how to act ; but the result of a second, and then of a third invitation, each more urgent than the former, accompanied with the offer of a public conveyance, convinced him that it was his duty to return. Leaving therefore Aquileia, which had been the place of his abode since the Council of Sardica, he waited

A.D. 349.

S. Athanasius is recalled.

on Constans at Milan, and on Pope Julius at Rome; and furnished with a letter from the latter to the Church of Alexandria, exhorting them to receive their Pastor with all joy and thankfulness, he went by land to Antioch. Here he was favourably received by Constantius, who confirmed by word of mouth all that he had before written: and besides this wrote many letters in his favour, and swore to the sincerity of his own joy at his return. S. Athanasius in the mean while carefully abstained from the communion of Leontius of Antioch, assisting in the private assemblies of the Eustathians, as the Catholics were called in that city, from their last Bishop, and one of the Fathers of Nicæa. The Emperor took the opportunity of asking, not as a matter of right, but simply as a favour, that in consideration of the large body of Arians at Alexandria, Athanasius would allow them the use of one church. The latter at once consented; "but then," he added, "it is but just that the Eustathians, who are also a numerous body, should have the use of one church in this city." Constantius replied that he was satisfied with the proposition: but on consulting with his Arian Bishops, he found them averse from closing with it. "Arianism," they urged, "will make no great progress at Alexandria, while Athanasius is there; on the contrary, if the great number of the Eustathians comes to be known, their tenets will spread more and more extensively in Antioch." The Emperor on their advice withdrew his request.¹

S. Athanasius, in his progress through Egypt, held ordinations every where, according to the peculiar right of the See of Alexandria. The joy of that city on his return was unbounded. Prelates from every part of Egypt were awaiting his arrival; multitudes pressed round him, as he entered: many embraced the monastic life as a token of thankfulness; each house seemed for the time turned into a church; charity was extensively bestowed on orphans and widows; many among the heretics joined the Catholic Church; many of the enemies of S. Athanasius openly retracted their sentiments; many others who had appeared against him, visited him in private, assuring him that in their hearts they had always clung to his communion. In

¹ Hist. Arian, ad Monach. xxii, Sozomen, H. E. iii. 20. Theodoret, H. E. ii. 12.

the words of the Sacred Historian, "there was great joy in that city."¹

The peace with which the Church of Alexandria was blessed remained unbroken by the commotions which shortly afterwards arose in the Western Empire; the murder of Constans, the civil war of the three claimants to the purple, the battle of Mursa, and the final accession of Gallus as Cæsar. But Liberius, having succeeded to the chair of S. Peter, vacant by the death of Julius, the Eastern Bishops took that opportunity of requesting the new Pope to refuse his communion to Athanasius.²

A.D. 352.

At the same time a memorial in favour of the latter was presented from about seventy Egyptian Bishops: and Liberius and his Council at Rome remained firm to the Church of Alexandria. The Eusebians renewed their calumnies to Constantius, persuaded him that the ill-will of Constans toward himself had been an effect of the machinations of Athanasius: that they,³ and the Emperor as well, were regarded by the Catholics as heretics: and finally, that Magnentius, the murderer of Constans, had been supported by the influence of the Bishop of Alexandria. Constantius, forgetting his promises and his oath, and being completely under Arian influence, became daily more inveterate in his hatred to that Prelate: though as yet veiling his ill-will.

The Arians, shortly afterwards, invented a method of annoying Athanasius, of implication in which it is difficult to acquit the Emperor. They forged a letter, as addressed by the Bishop to Constantius, in which he requested permission to wait upon him in Italy, for the purpose of conferring with him on Ecclesiastical affairs. Accordingly, to the great surprise of Athanasius, an officer of the palace named Montanus, visited him, and informed him that he was to be transported at the public expense to Italy. The Prelate, after some hesitation, determined on remaining where he was: and explained by letter to the Em-

¹ See the fine description in the panegyric of S. Gregory Nazianzen, § 17.

² It has been asserted that Liberius was at first persuaded to refuse his communion to S. Athanasius, on the strength of an epistle, to be found

among the fragments of S. Hilary. (Ed. Bened. 1327.) But this letter is well shewn to be a forgery, in the Benedictine Edition of the works of that Father. Tillemont, (viii. 233,) believes it genuine.

³ Sozomen, H. E. iv. 8.

peror the fraud that had been used. This behaviour was, by his opponents, treated as a crime of disobedience to Constantius.¹

Athanasius despatched five Bishops, one of whom was Sera-
A.D. 353.
 pion of Thmuis, and three Priests, to the Court, to watch the turn of affairs. By the artifices of the Eusebians he was condemned in a Council holden at Arles this year; the Pope's legate, Vincent Bishop of Capua, and probably the same who had been present at Nicea, after much persuasion, and with great reluctance, signing the sentence. He, however, in some measure repaired this fault, by his subsequent noble behaviour with respect to the apostacy at Rimini. The news of this event probably gave rise to the composition of the great apology of S. Athanasius, commonly called his second: it contains only a short introduction and conclusion of his own, the greater portion being taken up with a collection of documents which establish his innocence. He afterwards appended some additional matter to it; for, as we have it now, it contains allusions to events which did not occur till subsequently.

Liberius, afflicted and indignant at the betrayal of the Faith by his legates at Arles, demanded another Council: it was summoned by Constantius, then at Milan, in that city. Heresy again triumphed. Athanasius was condemned; but the Church
A.D. 355.
 of Rome was no longer implicated in the sin. Liberius was banished; Felix, Archdeacon of Rome, himself a believer in the Faith of Nicæa, though communicating with the Arians, was consecrated Bishop of Rome, thus becoming an Antipope, and Hosius of Cordova was harassed and persecuted. A persecution broke out every where; the Catholic Bishops were in many places insulted or exiled; and to crown the misfortunes of the Church, in this year Julian the Apostate was made Cæsar.

Officers from the Court arrived at Alexandria, charged, as they said, with orders that all should communicate with the Arians; and that Athanasius should present himself before the Emperor.² Athanasius demanded to see the instructions of the officers, but they were not forthcoming; and so many prepared to arm themselves in defence of their Bishop, that the Arians did not at once dare to proceed. Troops however were thrown

¹ Sozomen, H. E. iv. 9. ² Apol. ad Constant. xix, &c. Hist. ad Monach. lii.

A.D. 356. in from every part of Egypt; and there appeared some danger of a civil commotion, when the dispute was compromised by the agreement that Athanasius should be left in quiet possession of his Church, till the Emperor's pleasure could be more definitely known. The Bishop addressed a circular to all his suffragans, exhorting them to constancy in the Orthodox Faith, by a recapitulation of the variations existing at different times and in different places between the Creeds adopted by the Arians, as contrasted with the One Faith of Nicæa; of the violences employed by their Prelates, and the remembrance of those Holy Bishops as well living as dead, who had exerted themselves manfully for Catholic Truth.

Persecution
at Alexan-
dria:

A.D. 356.

In spite of the assurance given that the orthodox should not for the present be molested in their public assemblies, as the people were keeping vigil on Thursday night, February 8,¹ in the Church of S. Theonas, the Emperor's officers, conducted by the Arians, and followed by five thousand soldiers, invested the whole place, rendering escape impossible. S. Athanasius remained in his Throne, and ordered one of his Deacons to read the hundred and thirty-sixth Psalm, which dwells on the eternity of God's mercy, exhorting the congregation to respond, "His mercy endureth for ever," and then to retire. The soldiers burst in: swords were unsheathed, and bows drawn: some persons of the assembly were killed by the arrows, and a general rush made towards the door. Athanasius still remained in his place; the soldiers surrounded the Choir, or rather the Holy of Holies; the monks formed in a close body round their Bishop, and bore him off; but such was the heat, the violence, the confusion, and the struggle, that he fainted, and was carried out for dead. This is one of the events which may lead us to suspect that Athanasius was not a man of much physical courage; and the rather to admire the grace which enabled him to give so long and so arduous a proof of moral constancy.

The corpses were buried, in order to prevent inquiry: but those who fell on this occasion are reckoned among the Martyrs. The arrows found in the church were preserved, as incontestable proofs of the outrage; the soldiers attempted to obtain posses-

¹ See Bolland. Jan. ii. p. 140.

sion of them, but were prevented by the Catholics. A protest was drawn up by the latter, and forwarded to Constantius. So far from attending to it, he addressed a letter to the people of Alexandria, approving what had been done, and exhorting them to drive from the city Athanasius, whom, he said, he had only recalled out of respect to the wishes of his brother. Heraclius, to whom this letter was sent, read it in public, and declared that resistance to the wishes of the Emperor would be absolutely useless: if the inhabitants would not communicate with the Arians, their public allowance of corn should be stopped; and if the Pagans would not declare their readiness to receive that Bishop whom the Emperor should appoint, their idols would be taken from them. It is hard to say whether the latter threat were more blasphemous or ludicrous; nevertheless, it produced great effect. The Cathedral was shortly after attacked by Heraclius with a band of Pagans and heretics; the same violencees were committed that have been described in the church of S. Theonas: the altar, the throne, the seats, and the curtains were publicly burnt, and incense was offered in the fire to the idols of Alexandria. It was noted as a mark of Divine vengeance, that one of the rioters, who seated himself insolently in the Bishop's chair, was pierced by a splinter, and died in a few hours.

During these troubles, S. Antony, who had now attained the hundred and fifth year of his age, found his health gradually decline. Calling two of his most favoured disciples to him, he said, "My sons, as Scripture saith, I am going the way of all the earth: the LORD hath called me, and I am desirous to depart." After exhorting them to avoid all heresy and schism, he left one sheep-skin cloak, and a cloak on which he was then lying, to S. Athanasius: another sheep-skin to S. Serapion of Thmuis: and his vest of hair to those whom he was addressing. "And now," he continued, "farewell; Antony is going,—and will not be seen in this world among you again." And so he departed to his rest.

Death of S.
Antony.

SECTION XXII.

THIRD EXILE OF S. ATHANASIUS.

George,
Anti-Patri-
arch.

ONE George had been ordained by the Arians for the See of Alexandria. Of low birth, he had first been a parasite, then a pork contractor for the army, then forced to fly on a charge of dishonesty; and now he was made Bishop of the Second See in the world. He had probably been ordained at Antioch two years previously,¹ and was by many believed to be a Pagan: his very appearance testified the sensuality and cruelty of his disposition, and he did not give himself the trouble to make any pretence to religion. He made his entrance into Alexandria during Lent; and though behaving with the greatest insolence from the beginning, his principal cruelties were reserved for the week after Pentecost. Many were put to death for the Catholic Faith; and the tortures invented for them by George were quite worthy of the most ferocious of the Pagan Tyrants.

S. Athana-
sius in the
desert.

Athanasius retreated into the desert: diligent search was made for him, but in vain: and the persecution extending itself throughout the whole of Egypt, many Bishops were driven into banishment. S. Athanasius shortly after resolved on a personal appeal to the Emperor, and was only debarred when actually on his journey, by authentic news of the consequences of the Council of Milan, and a perusal of two letters of Constantius. One of these was addressed to the Princes of Axum, desiring them to send Frumentius, now at the head of a very flourishing Church, to be examined by George of Alexandria: in order, that if his sentiments were heretical, he might be sent into exile, or if approved, re-ordained. It appears that one Theophilus, an Arian Bishop, after visiting the western coast of Arabia, and the island of Socotra, came to Axum, and thence returned to the Court; but neither his mission, nor the Emperor's letter, occasioned

¹ On this point compare Pagi 354, ix.; Tillemont, viii. 268; and Fleury, iii. 428.

any difficulty to Frumentius, who steadily persevered to the end of his course in the Catholic Faith, and dying peaceably, was succeeded by Cosmas, commemorated, like himself, in the Ethiopic Calendar. Athanasius employed the period of his exile in visiting, and informing himself on, the Monasteries of Egypt. He also composed another apology¹ and addressed it to Constantius, in which he clears himself from the charges of having sown discord between the two Royal brothers; of having assisted the usurper Magnentius; of having celebrated the Holy Eucharist in the great church, while yet unconsecrated; (this was a new accusation of his enemies, and he defends himself by producing several instances, where in case of necessity the practice had been allowed by Bishops whom the whole Church venerated :) and finally, of disobeying the Emperor in refusing to leave Alexandria.²

The tidings which S. Athanasius received in the desert grew A.D. 357. every day worse and worse. First, he heard of the persecution raised by Macedonius at Constantinople; next of the creed of the Council of Sirmium, which, so far from pronouncing the Son to be Consubstantial, would not allow Him to be like in substance; then of the persecution of Hosius of Cordova, who was more than a hundred years old, and had presided at Sardica,—of his courageous resistance of torture,—his fall, his communicating with the Arians, his bitter repentance, and death; then of the fall of Liberius, and loss of the immaculateness of S. Peter's Chair: of the schism among the Arians, the one party affirming, the other denying, the Son to be of like substance: of the persecution, under Eudoxius of Antioch, of the former, who assumed the title of Eusebians, by the latter, under that of Anomœans, (from the Greek *anomoios*, *unlike*;) of the Council of Ancyra, where the former party, though still wide of the whole truth, shewed some symptoms of returning to the Catholic Faith; of the labours of S. Hilary in defence of that truth for which he was exiled; of the project of an Œcumenical Council at Nicæa; of the mischievous alteration, by which it was proposed to hold two simultaneous Councils of the East and

¹ Apolog. xiv.

account of Palladius (viii. 136) is not worth notice.

² Ammianus Marcellus, xxii. Sozomen, H. E. iv. 10. The marvellous

West ; of their assembling at Rimini and Seleucia respectively ; of the artifice by which the four hundred Bishops in the former place were led to subscribe to a formula which might be interpreted to mean that the Son was created : of the deposition of George of Alexandria and other violent Arians, at Seleucia, where the Eusebians numbered one hundred and five out of one hundred and sixty Bishops ;¹ of the final victory of the Arians, by means of the Creed of Rimini, over both East and West, at Constantinople. Thus the whole world, as it were, became Arian ; and the Church Catholic was nearer to a general apostasy than she has ever at any other time, been permitted to come.

Athanasius in the meanwhile had not been idle. He had addressed a letter to the Monks of Egypt, in which he at length exposed the vacillation and perfidy of Constantius. He wrote a treatise on the new Confession of Faith adopted at Rimini and Seleucia ; forcibly exposing the absurdity of imagining that the Faith had till now been unknown. And Macedonius of Constantinople, deposed as an Eusebian by the Anomœans, having been the author of a new heresy, which denied the Divinity of the HOLY GHOST, and his followers, thence called Pneumatomachi, or *Fighters against the SPIRIT*, extending themselves widely, S. Athanasius, in a third treatise, refuted his blasphemy.

¹ It has been thought by some, that S. Athanasius himself was present, though incognito, at the Council of Seleucia. The principal ground for this belief is the expression of that Father himself, at the beginning of his treatise on the Councils of Seleucia and Rimini, where he says that he will relate *ἅπερ ἐώρακα καὶ ἔγνων ἀκριβῶς*. But in the first place, it is hardly likely that one, who was compelled to fly for safety into the remoter parts of the desert, should be able, under any disguise, to have left Egypt entirely, and ventured as far as Seleucia. Next, if his words are to be taken literally, they would imply that he was also present at Rimini, which would have been physically impossible. Lastly, it is singular that no record should exist, in the writings of other

Fathers, of the intercourse which must have taken place between two such pillars of orthodoxy as S. Athanasius and S. Hilary, the latter of whom, then an exile in Phrygia, was allowed to be present. There is a difficulty also in the numbers of the Prelates who met at Seleucia. Socrates says, that the number of pure Arians was 34 ; S. Epiphanius, 43 ; but S. Hilary (*contra Const.* 12) reduces it to 19. It does not appear easy to reconcile the latter testimony, though that of an eye-witness, with the express assertions of S. Athanasius, who makes the whole number about 160, of Socrates, who fixes it at 160, or even Theodoret, who makes it 150 ; since all seem to agree that the semi-Arians numbered about 105. See the Benedictine note on S. Hilary. ii. 452.

The Church was now in a very low condition : Athanasius was her principal support in the East, and S. Hilary, or rather his influence, in the West : but God was raising up other champions,—S. Martin of Tours, S. Basil, and S. Gregory Nazianzen. If the Church of Alexandria were divided, much more was that of Antioch, split, as it was in a short period, into three factions ; the Eustathians, or old Catholic party : the Meletians, or followers of Meletius, a Catholic in heart, (though consecrated by the Eusebians,) and reckoned among the Saints ; and the Euzöians, or pure Arians, so called from their lately advanced Bishop Euzöius, one of those Deacons whom S. Alexander of Alexandria had excommunicated in the beginning of the troubles. It is necessary here to note this, because this schism led to important consequences. The bright spot in the horizon of the Church was the increasing inclination of the Eusebians to return to the True Faith ; they seemed startled at the depths of impiety into which their scheme led, when consistently carried out ; and when they had to decide between the *Consubstantial* and the *Dissimilar in Substance*, seldom failed to prefer the former.

Such was the state of things when Julian declared himself Emperor at Paris, but offered to share the world with Constantius. The latter, preparing to march against him, fell ill of a fever ; and finding his illness mortal, received baptism from the hands of Euzöius the Arian, and shortly after departed this life.

Julian succeeded peaceably : and to shew his contempt of Christianity proclaimed a general toleration for all sects, and liberty for the exiled Bishops to return. Of this edict Athanasius did not dare to avail himself, on account of the violences committed by George in Alexandria. But the end of this wretched man was approaching.

Artemius, general of the forces in Egypt, was accused by the Pagans to Julian of having deprived the temples of their dues, and appropriated their wealth to other uses ; and his head was struck off by the Emperor's order, at Antioch. George had irritated the heathen in a similar way, and they now turned their fury against him.¹ Odious to the Catholics for his persecutions and blasphemies, disliked by the Arians for his vacilla-

¹ Socrat. H. E. iii. 2. Sozomen. H. E. iv. 30.

Murder of
George.

tion and time-servingness, he now offended the Pagans by bringing to light the cruelties attendant on the worship of Mithras, having discovered the skeletons of those who had been its victims, when building a church on the spot once appropriated to those rites. The Gentiles could not endure this exposure of their enormities; they assaulted the church where George was, slew several of his adherents, and tying cords to his feet, and to those of two of his friends, dragged them up and down the city till life was extinct; then burning them on the sea shore, they scattered their ashes on the waves, fearing that their victims might be honoured as martyrs; an apprehension most certainly groundless, so far as respects the tyrant and the blasphemer George. Julian overlooked the riot, though not failing in his epistle to blame¹ the Alexandrians for the want of reverence it evinced to their god Serapis.

S. Athanasius again
returns.
A.D. 362.

S. Athanasius lost no time in returning to Alexandria: and mounted on an ass, he made his entry into that city. The same joy prevailed as on his previous restoration. Roofs, walls, and battlements were thronged; incense was burnt, and torches lit; the Catholics present from all parts in the great mart of the world, vied with each other in doing honour to the Confessor: the inhabitants of Alexandria, in different divisions, according to their age and sex, gave welcome to their Bishop: there were feasts in public, and banquets in private. The Arians were driven from their churches; the Mystery of the Most Holy and Consubstantial TRINITY was again preached in them: and nothing distinguished the Professors of the Catholic Faith more illustriously than the gentleness with which their persecutors were treated.² Those Arians who still retained their heresy, obtained episcopal consecration for Lucius, a Priest ordained by George.³

A Council was next held at Alexandria, at which S. Eusebius of Vercell, an illustrious Confessor for the Faith in the West, was present: he, and the celebrated Lucifer of Cagliari, had

¹ Socrat. H.E. iii. 3. Julian. Apost. Ep. 10. Philostorg. ii. 7, who lays the blame of the transaction to Athanasius. Ammian. Marc. xv. 7.

² S. Greg. Nazianz. Encom. 18.

³ It is difficult to understand how the Benedictine Editors can deny that Lucius was actually consecrated, 362, 6. See Le Quien, ii. 403, 404.

been banished into the Upper Thebais: and, when the edict of Julian allowed them to return to their Sees, Eusebius proposed to go back by way of Antioch, for the sake of settling the distractions of that Church, while Lucifer should repair to Alexandria, and give his assistance to Athanasius in the Synod which was then on the point of assembling. Lucifer unhappily preferred to visit Antioch: and there, by consecrating Paulinus Bishop for the Eustathians, instead of inducing them to communicate with the Meletians, he perpetuated the schism. He however dispatched a Deacon to Alexandria, with orders to assent to what should there be done.

The Council of Alexandria, on the contrary, was not more distinguished for its firmness than for its moderation.¹ The first business was to decide with respect to those who had been induced to subscribe the formula of Rimini. They had anathematized all such as should say that the Son of God was a creature like other creatures, meaning thereby, that He was not a creature at all; while the Arians intended to assert that being a creature, He was yet different from other creatures. The Bishops who had subscribed, protested in the most solemn manner that they had meant no harm: some further affirmed that they had only attached their names to the formula, in order that by retaining their churches, they might be enabled to exclude heretical Prelates from possessing them. There was a difference of opinion in the Council on this subject; some were for deposing all those who had subscribed this formula, or any other heretical Creed; the greater part pointed out the tremendous breach that such a sweeping condemnation would occasion; others wished that those who had fallen should content themselves with the Communion of their own Church, being separated from that of all other Churches. But in the end, gentler sentiments prevailed. The Bishops who had erred were only compelled to anathematize Arius, and to subscribe to the Creed of Nicæa; and even those of the opposite party were received into lay communion, on renouncing their errors.

The Divinity of the HOLY GHOST, and the equality of the co-eternal TRINITY was affirmed by the Council, who next pro-

Council of
Alexandria

¹ S. Athanas. Tom. ad Antioch. (i. 615.) Epist. ad Rufin. (i. 768.)

Question of
One or
Three
Hypostases.

ceeded to settle a point of dispute between two parties of the Catholics. The one asserted Three Hypostases in the TRINITY, the other only One: the former were called Arians, the latter Sabellians, by their opponents. S. Athanasius perceived that the Faith of both parties was orthodox, and that the dispute was only about words. To the asserters of Three Hypostases, he said, "Do you mean by these words, as the Arians do, Three substances differing from each other, or, as other heretics, Three Principles, or Three Gods?" "God forbid," they replied: "we only mean that the FATHER is and exists; that the SON is and exists in the Substance of the FATHER; and that the HOLY GHOST is and exists: we abhor the heresy that teaches the existence of Three Principles: we hold the SON to be Consubstantial with the FATHER, and the HOLY GHOST inseparable from the Substance of Both." "This," said the Council to their opponents, "is the very Catholic Faith. But you, who hold One Hypostasis only in the HOLY TRINITY, do you mean, with Sabellius, to annihilate the Substance of the SON and the HOLY GHOST?" "God forbid," they answered: "we merely use the word in the sense of substance, that we may assert the HOLY TRINITY to be Consubstantial." Then said the Council to both parties, "You are all agreed, then, in anathematizing Arius and Sabellius, Paul of Samosata and Manes, and to subscribing the Creed of Nicæa." Thus unity was restored among the orthodox. In a similar way, those who, both holding the Faith, were dissatisfied with each others' expressions on the subject of the Incarnation, were made to allow their real accordance. In this Council Asterius, an Arabian Bishop, was spokesman for the Eastern, Eusebius of Vercil for the Western Church.

S. Athanasius, writing in the name of the Council to the Church of Antioch, detailed the proceedings which we have recounted: and sent several other letters on the same subject to the more influential among the Bishops. The only unfortunate result of this most Catholic Synod, was the schism of Lucifer of Cagliari, who would not communicate with those who received to their communion the subscribers of the formula of Rimini. Thus the Luciferians were with respect to the Demi-Arians what the Novatians were to the Pagans; though in no

other respect can the two sects be compared. For Lucifer had been a Confessor for the truth, and, but for his unhappy division, would doubtless have been reckoned among the Saints by the Church at large, as by a peculiar devotion of that of Sardinia he is to this day.¹ Of the proceedings of the Apollinarians in this Council we shall have a further occasion to speak.

SECTION XXIII.

FOURTH AND FIFTH EXILES OF S. ATHANASIUS: HIS RETURN AND DEATH.

THE Pagans, emboldened by the favour of Julian, addressed a memorial to him, in the same year, against S. Athanasius, whom they represented as the great enemy of their religion, and the preventer of the due exercise of their rites. For they had recently re-introduced the murder of infants, for the purpose of drawing auguries from an inspection of their entrails. Julian replied, that although out of his moderation he had allowed all the Galileans, banished by Constantius, to return, yet he would not suffer the insolence they complained of in the case of Athanasius, whom he commanded on the receipt of that epistle to leave the city.² The Christians also presented, though in vain, a memorial: Julian taunted them with being the slaves of those Hebrews who had been bondmen to their fathers, and with preferring a man accused of the most heinous crimes, to the memory of Alexander their founder, and Serapis their guardian god; and Athanasius, who had at first been required only to leave Alexandria, was now commanded to withdraw from Egypt.

Athanasius
banished by
Julian.

Troops were sent to drive the Bishop into exile, with orders, if they were able, to slay him: the Cæsarea, or great church, was sacked and burnt. S. Athanasius consoled his weeping friends by assuring them that it was a cloud that would soon pass. He embarked in a boat, and sailed up the Nile towards the Thebais.

¹ And the Bollandists soreckon him: on the subject; a schism which, they endeavouring to prove that, though he say, owed its origin to his disciples.
disapproved of the decree of Alexandria, ² Socrat. H. E. ii. 13, 14. Sozomen,
he never went so far as to raise a schism H. E. v. 15. Theodoret, H. E. iii. 9.

He was soon missed, and pursued; but a friend had time to give him warning of the design against his life. With great presence of mind, he ordered the boat to be put about, and descended the river towards Alexandria: in a short time he was met by the murderers, who demanded if Athanasius was far before him. "He is very near," replied the friends of the Prelate, according to others S. Athanasius himself; and the boat of the officer was urged on with greater speed.

A.D. 363.

Vision of
Didymus.

Death of
Julian.

Julian was now on his expedition against the Persians. Didymus, celebrated in the Church of Alexandria for his piety, and, although blind, for his learning, was in deep distress at the tidings of persecutions in different places, and at the general exultation of the Pagans. He had passed a whole day, towards the end of June, in fasting and prayer: and as he slumbered in his chair, at one o'clock in the morning, heard a voice say distinctly, "Julian is dead; rise, and eat, and send tidings to Athanasius." Didymus carefully noted the day and hour; and found that at that very hour the Apostate had indeed gone to his account: as though wounded in the morning, he survived till after midnight. S. Athanasius, it is said, received a yet earlier intimation of the Emperor's fall. While at Antinoë, he received a visit from Pammon, an Abbat in the adjacent country, and S. Theodore of Tabenna. By their advice he betook himself to the cells governed by the last-named hermit; and while one day lamenting the state of the Church to his two friends, was amazed to see them look at each other, and interchange a smile. "Are you mocking the weakness of my faith?" demanded the Prelate. On which they informed him that the tyrant had been summoned to his account.¹

Arianism now began to totter. The succeeding emperor Jovian professed himself a Catholic, and recalled the Bishops banished by Julian. Athanasius had not waited for this summons, but had previously returned to Alexandria. He was here agreeably surprised by receiving a letter from the Emperor, requesting from him a True Exposition of the Catholic Faith. He assembled a Council, and inserted in his reply the Creed of Nicæa, and a brief but clear explanation of it. Jovian requested

¹ Bolland. Mar. 14, p. 71.

Athanasius to visit him at Antioch, where, shortly afterwards, a small Council was held, by those in the Communion of S. Meletius, where several Demi-Arian Bishops approved of the term *Consubstantial*. The proceedings of this Council having been laid before Athanasius, he wished to enter into Communion with Meletius: but the affair was procrastinated by the Meletians till it fell to the ground.¹

Lucius, the Arian Bishop of Alexandria, and his friends, made a journey to Antioch, wishing to influence the Emperor in their favour: but they only succeeded in incurring his indignation: and to make the prospects of their sect yet darker, a schism broke out among the pure Arians.

Athanasius, on his return into Egypt, spent some time in visiting its principal monasteries, more especially that of S. Pacomius. We may refer to this period his letter to Rufinianus, who had consulted him on the proper method of dealing with penitent heretics. The Prelate points out that various Synods had already defined the matter; that the originators of heresy, if ecclesiastics, were, on repentance, to be received to lay Communion only; those who had joined the heresy through ignorance or infirmity, were to be retained in the enjoyment of their full rank. In this decision, he says, the whole Catholic Church was agreed: the Luciferians only objected and rebelled. While thus engaged, he heard of the death of Jovian, and the appointment of Valentinian as Emperor, who at once gave the East to his brother Valens. The happy reconciliation, in a great measure, of the Eastern with the Western Church followed: and was succeeded by the Arian persecution of Valens.

At its outset, an Edict was passed, banishing those Bishops who, having been exiled under Constantius, had returned under Julian. In virtue of this proclamation,² the prefect of Egypt endeavoured to deprive the Alexandrian Catholics of their churches, and to drive Athanasius from the city. The orthodox replied, that Athanasius did not come under the terms of the edict: that he had indeed been banished by Constantius, but had also been restored by the same Emperor; and were on the point of taking up arms in defence of their Bishop. The Prefect wrote

A.D. 367.
Persecution
of Valens.

¹ S. Basil. Ep. 371. 249. ² Socrat. H. E. iv. 13. Sozomen, H. E. vi. 12.

to Valens for instructions, and the sedition was appeased. A few days after, S. Athanasius, divinely warned of impending danger, left his house and the city towards evening, and hid himself in the tomb of his father. Towards midnight the prefect surrounded the house with troops, hoping to seize Athanasius, and convey him quietly from the city. This was the last trouble which befell the Confessor: an order came from Valens to recall him; and after a few months' absence, he again entered Alexandria.

Various conjectures have been made as to the reasons which induced Valens, while persecuting the other Catholic Bishops and their flocks, to spare Athanasius and Alexandria. It is probable that he did so either from fear of Valentinian, who might have taken it ill that so great a champion of the truth should suffer any thing; or by the persuasion of the Arians, unwilling to bring the powerful genius of Athanasius in contact with the mind of Valens, and fearing that persecution might induce him to try the force of a personal appeal to the Emperor.

A.D. 370. S. Athanasius had now governed Alexandria more than forty years, and the end of his life was peaceful. At the head of a Council of ninety Bishops, he remonstrated with S. Damasus of Rome, that Auxentius, the Arian Bishop of Milan, had not been excommunicated, and his representation had the desired effect.¹ The synodal letter addressed by this Synod to the Bishops of Africa exists among the writings of S. Athanasius.

About this period we meet with an instance of his willingness to drop the rights of his See where the good of the Church was at stake. There was, in Pentapolis, a See called Erythrum, which comprehended, among other villages, the petty towns of Palæbisca and Hydrax. Orion, Bishop of Erythrum, a man advanced in years, was solicited by the inhabitants of Palæbisca and Hydrax, in consideration of their distance from the See, and his own infirmities, to consecrate a young man named Siderius, their Bishop. Orion consented, and the ceremony was performed by Philo, Bishop of Cyrene, a well meaning man, but inexact in his observance of the Laws of the Church, without any reference to the See of Alexandria, and by himself: thus violating two Canons. S. Athanasius not only confirmed Siderius in his Sec, but some

Siderius of
Palæbisca.

¹ Theodoret, H. E. ii. 22.

time after, approving his character, translated him to the Church of Ptolemais, which we now find to have become, in a sense, Metropolitcal. He did credit to the choice of the people : and in old age, resigning the more honourable See of Ptolemais, retired to end his days in the charge of his former See. We also find him excommunicating the governor of Libya for cruelty :¹ defending S. Basil, lately made Bishop of Cæsarea ; at length apparently reconciled to Meletius ;² and instructing Epictetus in the Mystery of the Incarnation, which the widely-spreading Apollinarian heresy rendered a necessary task.

Three years after the date of this work, S. Athanasius was A.D. 373.*

¹ Synesius, Ep. 67.

² S. Basil, Epp. 47, 52.

* The date of the decease of S. Athanasius is, as is well known, a question of great difficulty. Those who would place it in A.D. 371, ground their decision on the following argument. 1. Socrates, whose Consular chronology is very exact, places the death of the Patriarch under the Consuls Gratianus and Probus : that is, in the year 371. 2. It is well known from the testimony of S. Cyril, Socrates, and others, that S. Athanasius only sat forty-six years. But S. Alexander's decease cannot be placed later than April 18, 326 : and (as we have seen) the Roman Martyrology places it February 26 of that year. This seems to fix that of S. Athanasius in 371 or 372. On the other hand, it is urged : 1. That S. Proterius of Alexandria, who certainly ought to have been acquainted with the principal events in the life of his illustrious predecessor, says expressly, that he was alive at Easter, A.M. 89 : that is, March 31, A.D. 373. 2. The *Chronicon Orientale* informs us that S. Athanasius died on Thursday, May 2, which gives the same year. 3. S. Jerome fixes the ordination of Peter II. in 373 ; and we have no intimation that the See was long vacant. 4. It is almost

certain that S. Basil was not consecrated Bishop till the spring of A.D. 370. But it is impossible that in the short space of eleven months so many letters could have passed between him and S. Athanasius, as they certainly wrote to each other. With respect to the first argument on each side, we must confess that it is almost equally hard to believe Socrates or S. Proterius inaccurate : for to assert that the latter simply meant that S. Athanasius *regulated* the difficult Easter of A.D. 373, is absurd. Therefore we must be guided solely by the weight of the other arguments. But the second reason for 371 is of very little force : because it assumes that the death of S. Alexander, and consecration of S. Athanasius, were synchronous. Now S. Athanasius was absent at the death of his predecessor ; and, as we have seen, the Meletian Theonas was intruded into the See, which he occupied three months. This, according to our reckoning, would make the ordination of S. Athanasius to have taken place at the latter end of May, 326 ; and thus, if he died May 2, 370, he would not have sat forty-seven years complete : or, in common parlance, he had sat forty-six years. If it be objected that Rufinus says, *Obiit quadragesimo et sexto anno Sacerdotii sui*, we reply that the authority of that

Death of S.
Athanasius.

attacked by a mortal illness. Being pressed to name his successor, he mentioned his faithful and aged companion Peter: and shortly afterwards, after so many perils and banishments, gave up the ghost in his bed, in his own house, justly claiming the most illustrious place among the Confessors, and known in his Church by the title of the Apostolic Patriarch. "And thus," as S. Gregory Nazianzen closes his panegyric, "he ended his life in peace, and he was gathered to his fathers in a good old age, to the Patriarchs and Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs, who strove for the truth. And on his departure he received more excellent honours than those which attended his entrances to the city: for he so left this world, as to move the tears of many, and to leave a glorious remembrance of himself, of more value than visible tokens of respect, in the hearts of all."

SECTION XXIV.

PONTIFICATE OF PETER.

Peter II.
Pat. XXI.
A.D. 373.
A.M. 89.

THE death of S. Athanasius was a signal for fresh efforts on the part of the Arians. Peter was however peaceably enthroned by the unanimous voices of the clergy and people, the neighbouring Prelates having assembled with the utmost speed to prevent any attack of the opposite faction.

Euzöius of Antioch resolved to go himself to Alexandria, and to put Lucius into quiet possession of the See. This project was approved by Valens, who in the mean time wrote to Palladius, the prefect of Egypt, to drive out Peter by main force. This commission was very pleasing to Palladius, who was a Pagan: and assembling a band of heathens and of Jews, he sur-

writer is too much weakened by his notorious inaccuracies to render it of very great moment. The arguments which we have stated in behalf of 373, (and we might have adduced more,) appear incapable of a satisfactory answer: and therefore with the Benedic-

tine Editors, with Tillemont, (though he speaks less decidedly,) and with Pagi, we have fixed the latter year: in spite of the objections of Hermant, Petavius, Papebrochius, and Baronius, (which last writer puts the decease of S. Athanasius in 372.)

rounded the church of S. Theonas ; and informed Peter, that if he did not voluntarily retire, he would be dragged forth by force.

The Prelate was thrown into prison,¹ and on his liberation thought it prudent to retire : and the same scenes were re-acted, which in the time of S. Athanasius had been witnessed in the same church. A youth, infamous for his debauched life, mounted the altar, and there exhibited a popular dance ; another ascended the pulpit, and thence delivered an harangue in praise of vice.² Many of the Catholics suffered on this occasion, and are reckoned as Martyrs.

Shortly after, Euzöius and Lucius, in company with the Count Magnus, arrived in Alexandria. The blasphemous congratulations with which they were received by the Pagans must have been revolting even to themselves. "Welcome," they cried, "to the Bishop who does not acknowledge the Sox : welcome to the Bishop, the beloved of Serapis !" Nineteen Catholic Priests and Deacons, some of them in extreme old age, were dragged before the tribunal of Magnus the Quæstor, a man of bad character, who had narrowly escaped capital punishment under Jovian, for having destroyed the church of Berytus in the time of Julian the Apostate. He pressed them to communicate with the Arians, urging that even if they were in the right, God would surely pardon them for yielding to compulsion. They appealed to the Creed of Nicæa, and protested that they could not vary from that. Having been thrown into prison for several days, they were scourged in public, and banished to Heliopolis in Phœnicia. Those who by tears or gestures expressed their sympathy with the sufferers were also imprisoned or sent to the mines by Palladius the Præfect. Among the latter was the Deacon whom S. Damasus of Rome had commissioned to carry to Peter his congratulations and condolences on his accession to the Chair of S. Mark. Epiphanius even assures

He is thrown
into prison,
and retires.

Entry of
Lucius.

¹ So Sozomen : whom Baronius seems inclined (372, lxix.) to doubt, because Rufinus says nothing of the imprisonment of Peter. But Makrizi (§ 166) mentions it ; though Severus (Renaudot, p. 99) does not appear to

allude to it. It is stranger that Peter himself says nothing of his imprisonment.

² Theodoret, H. E. iv. 18, 19. Sozomen, H. E. vi. 19. Socrat. H. E. iv. 21.

us, that some of the most strenuous advocates of the Truth were condemned to the beasts.¹ With the details of this persecution we are acquainted from an encyclic epistle of Peter himself, preserved by Theodoret.

Though Arianism thus again prevailed in Egypt, it was in a far different manner from its former supremacy. Now the Church knew herself better: the Formula of Nicæa was acknowledged by all to be the expression of her belief; and the True Faith was known to be so by those who yielded to fear or constraint. The number of the Arians was also much diminished: the contest had more definitely assumed its true form, and was felt to be a struggle, not about words, but for the greatest Truth for which man can contend.

Euzöius, having accomplished his errand, returned to Antioch. Probably by his persuasion, Valens shortly afterwards issued an edict, commanding the banishment from Egypt of all who confessed the Consubstantial.² Eleven Bishops were sent into exile. The behaviour of S. Melas of Rhinocorura³ deserves to be mentioned. The soldiers sent to convey him to his place of exile reached his church towards evening, and found him engaged in preparing the lamps. Not imagining that a Prelate could be employed in so menial an office, they inquired for Melas. The Bishop informed them that he was within, and should be told of their arrival. Taking them into his house, he set supper before them, and himself waited at table: when they had finished he made himself known. They were so much touched by his humility and kindness, that they offered to let him escape; but S. Melas preferred sharing the exile of his brethren. He must have been at this time young; since Sozomen, writing nearly eighty years after, mentions his brother Solon, who succeeded him in the Episcopate and seems to have resembled him in virtue, as not long dead.

The Monks of Egypt were one of the great objects of the

¹ Hær. 68.

² Socrat. H. E. iv. 11. Sozomen, H. E. vi. 19.

³ Rhinocorura formed the boundary of Egypt and Phœnicia, and is accordingly sometimes reckoned to the one,

sometimes to the other. We learn from Sozomen that the Bishop and Clerks of this church lived together as canons regular, having a common house and a common table.—Le Quien, ii. 541, 2 Sozomen, H. E. vi. 31.

hatred of Lucius. He spared no pains in discovering their abodes ; and even himself led a large party of soldiers to drive them into exile. It is said that the inmates of a particular monastery which he was about to visit, were requested, as they often were, to pray over a paralytic man brought to them for that purpose. They anointed him with oil, and on saying the words, "In the Name of JESUS CHRIST Whom Lucius persecuteth, arise, and go to thy house !" they restored him whole to his friends. Neither their prayers, however, nor their miracles protected them from the insults and from the fury of the Arians ; till Lucius, perceiving that the number of the Monks prevented the exercise of any very severe measure against the whole of their body, contented himself with banishing their Abbats.

Persecution
of the
Monks :

Among the most illustrious of the exiles had been the two Macarii and Isidore. They were banished to an island in the Nile, the stronghold of Paganism, where the Gospel had not as yet been preached, and where the priest was honoured for the supposed sanctity of his life and prevalence of his prayers. At the moment that the bark which was carrying the Holy Confessors touched the shore, the daughter of this man was seized by a demon. Rushing down to the coast,—"We had trusted," she cried, "to be safe from you in this unknown spot : it is our ancient habitation ; here we abode in peace ; here we hurt none. But if you claim this island also, take it : we cannot resist your power." As the spirits thus spoke, they threw the maiden to the ground, convulsed her, and left her. The result of this miracle was the conversion of the whole island. The populace of Alexandria, on receiving intelligence of the event, were scarcely to be restrained from an open outbreak : and Lucius thought it prudent to give private orders for the release of the Macarii and Isidore.¹

exile of the
Macarii and
Isidore.

Peter, shortly after his release from prison, retired to Rome, where he was honourably received by S. Damasus, the successor of Liberius.² While there, he assisted at a Council held by S. Damasus against Apollinaris,³ whose heresy, as we have already

Peter at
Rome.

¹ Theodoret, H. E. iv. 21.

Hieron. Ant. Merendæ Vit. S. Damasi,
p. 43.

² S. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. in laudem

³ Epp. S. Damas. 2, 3 ; Vit. p. 55.

Apollinarian
Heresy.

observed,¹ may be said to have arisen at Alexandria. He had been for some time accused of teaching that the SAVIOUR was only in His Body a man, and that His Divinity supplied the place of a human soul; but his great reputation had rendered the Eastern Bishops unwilling to condemn him, though not hesitating to anathematize his doctrines. At length his errors became too flagrant to be any longer concealed or connived at: and the See of Alexandria had again the honour, in conjunction with that of Rome, to be the foremost in condemning heresy.

A D. 376.

Schism at
Antioch.

The presence of Peter at Rome was important on another account. The schism at Antioch, between the Eustathians, or old Catholic party, under their Bishop Paulinus, ordained by Lucifer before his return to the West, and the new Catholic party under S. Meletius, had troubled both the East and West. The holiest Bishops in the East, such as S. Basil and S. Eusebius of Samosata, sided with Meletius. S. Damasus and the Western Bishops communicated with Paulinus. Meletius asserted Three Hypostases in the HOLY TRINITY, Paulinus One: S. Damasus would not allow the former, for fear of being considered an Arian, nor S. Basil the latter, lest he should be imagined a Sabellian.² Notwithstanding the decision of the Chair of S. Peter, Meletius after his death was reckoned even by the Western Church among the Saints,—an honour not accorded to Paulinus. Peter served as a kind of connection between the two conflicting parties, though his sentiments inclined to those of Damasus. S. Basil addressed a letter to him while at Rome, on the subject, in which he complains in very strong language, that the Western Bishops, who could not be so well acquainted with the actual state of affairs, should presume to class Meletius and Eusebius among the Arians.

S. Basil also addressed an Epistle to the Faithful of Alexandria, in the absence of their Bishop, calling on them to contend earnestly for the Faith once for all committed to the Church, to call to mind their own illustrious Saints, to emulate them in their conflict, that they might be accounted worthy to share with them their glory, and to play the man for the LORD of Hosts.

¹ P. 38.

Ber. ap. S. Cyril, Ep. 13. S. Basil,

² Vit. S. Damas. pp. 60. 89. Acac. Ep. 214. S. Hieron. Ep. 15, i. 38.

A remarkable event which happened about this time must have convinced the Arians that they were not recognized by any party as the legitimate occupants of the Throne of Alexandria. Mauvia, Queen of the Saracens, who bordered on Palmyrene and Phœnicia Libanensis, had been engaged in a series of wars with the Roman Power, and had generally been successful. Terms of peace were offered, and accepted by the Queen, on condition that Moyses, a monk of reputation in her dominions, should be ordained Bishop of the Saracens. The proposal was considered reasonable; and Moyses was directed to receive consecration from Lucius. When brought before that Arian Prelate, "I am unworthy," said the Monk, "to receive the grace of the Episcopate at all: but if necessity be laid upon me, I refuse to accept it from a blasphemer of our LORD, and an intruder into a See already filled." However much Lucius might resent this public affront, for the protest was made in the presence of the civil authorities of Alexandria, the necessity of the case compelled him to acquiesce; and Moyses was ordained by the Metropolitan of Damascus.¹

Consecration of Moyses.

During the persecution of Lucius, the Monks of Egypt received the most essential services from the celebrated Melania, who was at that time on her way to Palestine, and remained eight months in the country.² Her zeal led her to provide retreats for a vast multitude of recluses; and during three days, she supported, at her own expense, five thousand monks. She was summoned before the Præfect, and threatened with the severest punishment, unless she consented to acquaint the magistrates with the names and hiding-places of those whom she maintained; but her popularity and high birth exempted her, though desirous of suffering for CHRIST, from further molestation.³

S. Melania in Egypt.

Valens, now at Antioch, found it necessary to defend Thrace from the incursions of the barbarians; and accordingly set out for Constantinople. But before leaving the city,⁴ he gave orders

¹ Rufin ii. 6. Socrat. H. E. iv. 29. Sozomen, H. E. vi. 38. Le Quien ii. 851, 852.

³ S. Paulin. Ep. 10; Baronius, 372, xcii., who proves that these events occurred in Egypt, and not in Palestine.

² Pallad. Lausiæ. cap. xxxiii.

⁴ Socrat. H. E. iv. 38. S. Hieron. Chron. Baronius, 377, 8.

Death of
Valens:
the persecu-
tion ceases.

that the persecution against the Catholics should cease, and that the exiles should be restored. As soon as the intelligence reached Rome, Peter, provided with letters of Communion from Damasus, returned to his Church, where he was received with great joy. On this, Lucius retired first to Constantinople, then to Berœa. Valens, by the just judgment of God, perished in his expedition. The few remaining months of the life of S. Peter were darkly clouded by an unfortunate action on his part, which threatened to lead to serious results.

Election of
S. Gregory
Nazianzen:

The Church of Constantinople was now in a most lamentable condition, having been in the hands of the Arians for more than forty years. Demophilus, their present Bishop, was altogether intolerable to the Catholics, and Theodosius, on being elevated to the purple in the East, was anxious to provide a Prelate who might be able to raise that important Church from her ruins. S. Gregory of Nazianzum, a Bishop without a See, appeared to the orthodox party the most eligible for the post; and he accordingly, not without great reluctance, came to Constantinople. His difficulties were at first great: the Arians possessed all the churches, and he was compelled to hold his assemblies in the house where his friends entertained him. This house afterwards became the celebrated church of the Resurrection: so called from the Resurrection of the Faith in Constantinople, which had its origin there. Peter favoured the election of S. Gregory, and, in virtue of the jurisdiction which Alexandria claimed, and still claims, over Constantinople in a vacancy of the latter See, instituted him therein.¹ But from whatever cause, he soon after repented of this action. There was one Maximus, a native of Alexandria, who although a Christian, professed himself a Cynic, and wore the ordinary dress of that sect of philosophers. This man, whose character had been notoriously bad, obtained from Peter a promise to ordain him Bishop of Constantinople. We are not informed by what artifices he procured this engagement; but having secured it, he sailed for Constantinople, where, partly by praising the eloquence of Gregory, and partly by exhibiting, as if received in Confession, the marks of stripes by which he had been punished for a misdemeanour, he insinuated himself into

Consecra-
tion of
Maximus.

¹ S. Greg. Nazianz. Carm. de Vitâ,

the confidence of the Bishop, and made some progress in popular esteem in the city. Having so far succeeded, he informed Peter of his proceedings, and requested him to send some Prelates for the purpose of consecrating him.

The character of Peter at this time stood high; and he used all his authority for the promotion of the design of Maximus. He dispatched three Bishops to Constantinople, with full powers to consecrate him. The pretext, however, under which these Prelates were sent, was the conveyance of the customary tribute of corn to Constantinople. On arriving in the Imperial City, they, in a most irregular and hurried manner, ordained Maximus.¹ The people were indignant: the expressions of their affection towards S. Gregory were numerous; and the intruder was compelled ignominiously to leave the city. The Emperor and the Pope declared against him; the latter, indeed, who did not approve of the Translation of Gregory, considered the See as vacant. Maximus, meanwhile, after a fruitless interview A.D. 379. with Theodosius at Thessalonica, returned to Alexandria, and urged Peter to assist him in re-establishing himself at Constantinople. To entreaties he added threats, declaring that if the Bishop of Alexandria would not give him the help he demanded, he should himself be deposed. But the Præfect of Egypt banished Maximus; and Gregory was for a short time quietly restored to his dignity.²

Peter's life was now drawing to an end. On the fourteenth Death of
Peter. of February, A.D. 380, he was taken from the world. His memory is venerated by the Coptic Church, which reckons him among the Saints. But the Church Catholic has refused him the title: partly on account of his inconstancy in the matter of Maximus; partly, as it would seem from S. Jerome, from the too great facility with which, after his return to Alexandria, he admitted heretics to his Communion;—thence laying himself open to the charge, though perfectly unfounded, of having received bribes for the purpose of shortening the period of their probation.³

¹ Pagi, 379, viii. The Chronology however is not without difficulties, inasmuch as evidence has been adduced to place the election of Maximus in A.D. 380; in which case he could not

have returned to Alexandria till after the death of Peter.

² S. Greg. Nazianz. Carm. de Vitâ.

³ Sollerius, p. 50*, § 259.

Fourteen days after the death of Peter, a law was published by Theodosius, then at Thessalonica, for the purpose of defining the Catholic Faith; in which Communion with S. Damasus of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria, is required in its professors. The tidings of the death of latter had not as yet reached Thessalonica.

SECTION XXV.

PONTIFICATE OF TIMOTHY.

Timothy,
Patr. XXII.,
A.D. 380;
A.M. 96.

ON the decease of Peter, Timothy, his brother,¹ who appears to have been designated by the dying Prelate as his successor, was, by the election of the Bishops and Clergy, placed in the vacant See.

A.D. 381.

Second
Œcumenical
Council.

In the year following this election, Theodosius, eager to put an end to the various disputes by which the Church was distracted, determined on convoking a numerous Synod for their consideration and settlement; and the Second General Council met at Constantinople. Though consisting only of Eastern Bishops, from the subsequent reception of its decrees by the whole Church it is justly regarded as Œcumenical.

The first proceeding of the assembled Fathers was to declare the consecration of Maximus null and void. This was done the more easily, because, from whatever reason, no Egyptian Bishop was then present at the Council. S. Meletius of Antioch, as Prelate of the See third in dignity, presided. Gregory was then solemnly installed in the Episcopal Throne, in spite of the most vigorous opposition on his own part. S. Meletius shortly after went to his reward; and it was now hoped that the Antiochene schism might cease. For it had been agreed by both parties, that of the two Prelates, Paulinus and Meletius, whichever should survive the other should be accounted by all as the Canonical Bishop. S. Gregory, now presiding in the Council, was urgent that this compact should be observed; but the younger Bishops could not endure the idea of thus yielding to

¹ Sozomen, H. E. vii. 5.

² Socrat. H. E. iv. 37. Eutychius, p. 491.

the Western Church, which had always continued in the Communion of Paulinus: and the schism was continued by the election of Flavian.

It was probably during this interval,¹ when neither Alexandria nor Antioch were properly represented in the Council, that its celebrated Canon was passed, whereby Constantinople was declared the second See. But Timothy constantly refused to allow the validity of this Canon; the Church of Rome did the same; and, for centuries after, Alexandria still held the second dignity everywhere but at Constantinople.

Timothy having arrived at the latter city, immediately attacked the validity of Gregory's translation; rather out of jealousy of the Eastern Church (Alexandria, as we have seen, always allying itself with Rome), than from any dislike to that Bishop. His opponents could not be more willing to insist on, than that aged Prelate was to tender his resignation: and the appointment of Nectarius to the See was the final result. On the cession of S. Gregory, Timothy presided in the Council; till disgust at the influence of the Eastern Prelates and at the Canon by which his own See was degraded, caused him to sail for Alexandria; and he refused again to leave his city, though invited to be present at the subsequent consecration of Nectarius.

It need hardly be said that the chief thing done in the Council of Constantinople, besides what has been specified, was the expansion of the Creed of Nicæa into that form which we, in common with the whole Catholic Church, employ in our Communion Office: the single point of difference being, that the Procession of the HOLY GHOST was only affirmed to be from the FATHER. In the law which gave force to the decrees of the Council, Timothy was named with Nectarius and other principal Bishops, as those with whom all, professing to be Catholics, were required to be in Communion.

Timothy, after returning to his flock, was under the happy reign of Theodosius spared the persecutions to which his prede-

¹ The time at which the several Canons of Constantinople were made is involved in much obscurity; and some will have it that the second and fourth Canons were enacted after the departure of Timothy. The account

given in the text seems on the whole the more probable. Of the subsequent reception of these Canons by Alexandria itself, we have spoken in the Introduction.

and dies,
July 20,
A.D. 385.

cessors had been subjected. He was an old man when raised to the See, and departed this life in peace, after having held it more than five years. Though not reckoned among the Saints by any except the Coptic Church,¹ his character stood high for piety and learning. The rescript of Theodosius to Optatus² speaks of him in the highest terms; and his contempt of riches appears to have been so great, as to obtain for him the surname of the Poor.³ His most celebrated work was a Canonical Epistle on Penance, still extant; and he had composed the lives of S. Apollos and other Egyptian recluses.⁴ He is said to have built several churches in Alexandria: and to have been eminently successful in the conversion of Arians.⁵

SECTION XXVI.

DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE OF SERAPIS:

THEOPHILUS AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

Theophilus,
Patr. XXIII.
A.D. 385.
A.M. 101.

THE episcopate of the two succeeding Patriarchs was the period at which the Church of Alexandria attained her highest dignity. The power of its Prelate was in some respects, as we have already observed, greater than that of the Bishop of Rome over his own Prelates; and the civil authority attached to the office was, as we shall have occasion to notice, exceedingly great.

Theophilus had been secretary to Athanasius, and was, so far

¹ On the 20th of July. Timothy, the citizen of Benhûr, in whose honour a church was built, the dedication of which is a Festival in the Coptic Calendar, does not appear to have been the same with this Patriarch, as Sollerius (p. 51,* § 265) thinks: but rather that Timothy who is celebrated by the Copts, together with his wife Mora, on the 23rd of November.

² Vir cum omnium sacerdotum susceptione venerandus, tum etiam nostro judicio approbatus. The rescript is quoted by Baronius, 385, xxxi.

³ Apophthegm. Patr.—Τιμοθέου τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας τοῦ λεγομένου ἁ κ τ ἡ μ ο ν ο ς. Le Quien, ii. 406.

⁴ Sozomen, H. E. vi. 29.

⁵ Eutychius, p. 491. Makrizi, § 173. These writers add that, in the Patriarchate of Timothy, the use of flesh on Easter Day was made compulsory (that is, even to the severest recluses), as a protest against the Manichæans. This Renaudot denies (p. 102).

as the management of business and the maintenance of his Church's dignity was concerned, a fit possessor of the Evangelical Throne. In other qualities yet more important for a Prelate, the contrast between himself and his predecessors is sorely to his disadvantage.

His first memorable action proves him, however, not to have A.D. 389. been wanting in zeal. There was at Alexandria¹ an ancient temple of Bacchus, once of great celebrity, but now so complete a ruin that only the walls remained. Theophilus obtained a Theophilus obtains a grant of the Temple of Bacchus: grant of it from the Emperor Theodosius, purposing to build a church on the spot. In clearing the ground for the foundations, various crypts were discovered, and in them figures connected with the abominations of the Phallic rites. The Pagans could not endure the discovery of their shame. They flew to arms: the Pagans take up arms, the Christians defended themselves, and, although the stronger party, would not attack their opponents. The latter, after having killed some of those who were most foremost in exposing their secret crimes, retired into the Temple of Serapis. This building served excellently as a fortress. It was raised on a terrace of enormous height; its form was square, with a central court; there were subterranean passages and communications known only to the Priests; the walls were massy, and composed externally of excellent masonry, while covered internally with copper plates, under which popular belief held a layer of silver to be concealed, while under that again was one of gold. The greater part of the edifice was taken up by lodgings and apartments of various kinds for the Priests and official attendants: the shrine itself was lighted with only one window, so contrived that at mid-day, once a year, a ray of the sun fell on the face of Serapis, an enormous figure, the extended hands of which reached from one side of the temple to the other: and precisely at that time the sun-god was brought on a visit of congratulation to his brother idol. The Pagans having fortified themselves in this building elected Olympius, a philosopher, as their leader: they were even bold enough to attempt a sally, in which some Christians were taken prisoners: these were instantly dragged to the altars, and either compelled to sacrifice, or exposed to the most cruel tortures. fortify themselves in the Temple of Serapis,

¹ Sozomen, H.E. vii. 15. Socrat. H.E. v. 16.

are summoned to
surrender,

refuse,

are pardoned,

and evacuate
the place.

Evagrius, the Præfect of Egypt, collected a few soldiers, and hastened to the temple, representing to the rebels the madness of hoping to resist the whole Roman power, and the punishment which a prolonged resistance would necessarily entail. Driven to despair, and encouraged by the harangues of Olympius, who exhorted them to suffer any extremity rather than abandon the gods of their ancestors, the besieged refused to listen to any terms of accommodation. As the situation of the place rendered it inaccessible, except with loss of life and by means of a regular storm, Evagrius thought it his duty to write to Theodosius for instructions how he should proceed in this conjuncture, and, in the mean time, the insurgents were left in quiet possession of the fortress. Theodosius replied, that he envied the lot of those Christians who had fallen in this affair, as esteeming them Martyrs; that their murderers should be freely forgiven (the invariable custom of the Church, lest the glory of the Martyr should be tarnished by revenge), but that, at the same time, all the temples of Alexandria, which had been the causes of this outbreak, should be demolished. Theophilus, in conjunction with Evagrius, charged himself with the execution of this edict. It was read in public: Christians as well as Pagans assembled to hear the result of the inquiry. The former, as soon as its bearing was manifest, gave a shout of exultation; the latter were struck with terror and fled; the insurgents, and Olympius among the rest, quitted the temple of Serapis, and left it an easy prey to the Catholics. It is said, that in the dead of the preceding night, the doors of the shrine being shut, and no person within it, the chant of "Alleluia!" was heard in its recesses. It is certain that the victory of the Christians was not stained with any blood; for even Helladius, the Priest of Jupiter, who had, or professed to have, slain nine persons in the revolt, was permitted to fly to Damascus, where he obtained a livelihood as a teacher of grammar.

Theophilus and the people repaired to the temple of Serapis for the purpose of effecting its destruction. There was however an ancient tradition that, when the idol should be destroyed, the earth would perish, the heaven fall in, and chaos would return. This belief, actually held by some, and influencing others almost unconsciously to themselves, held back the crowd from attempt-

ing its ruin. At length a soldier, possessing more courage than the rest, struck the image, which was of wood, though studded with various metals and precious stones, a blow on the cheek with his hatchet. A shout of horror arose from the Pagans, of triumph from the Christians. The soldier redoubled his blows : he smote the idol on the knee, and it fell ; a third blow lopped off the head. The Heathen were in expectation of some dreadful event : an extraordinary noise was heard in the body of the fallen god ; and a swarm of rats, its ancient tenants, escaped at the neck. Now all was derision and mockery : the unfortunate Serapis was hacked in pieces, and afforded materials for a bonfire ; and the images of the same deity, the common ornaments of the Alexandrian houses, were demolished, their place being supplied by a painting of the Cross.

The Image
of Serapis is
destroyed :

In levelling the foundations of the temple the Cross was found engraven on several of its stones ; and an ancient tradition was then remembered, purporting that, when that figure was triumphant, the worship of Serapis should be at an end. This prophecy has been imagined, like others, to have been made after the event ; but recent discoveries in Yucatan have strangely tended to confirm it. The Cross, in that country, was venerated long before the arrival of the Spaniards ; and a tradition was current to the effect that when it was triumphant, the Mexican gods would no longer be worshipped.

tradition
respecting
the Cross.

The Pagans had yet one strong hold on popular feeling. The celebrated Nile-gauge, kept till the time of Constantine in the temple of Serapis, transferred to the cathedral by Constantine, and brought back again at the command of Julian the Apostate, was now a second time removed to the church. The worshippers of Serapis prophesied that the Nile would not rise that year : on the contrary, it arose higher than had ever been known. A few years subsequently there was a deficient inundation : the Pagans attributed it to their being forbidden to appease the Nile by their usual sacrifices. The Governor, in reply to their remonstrances, assured them, that if such rites as theirs were necessary to the fertilization of Egypt, the goodness of the result did not compensate for the wickedness of the means. Shortly after, the river rose rapidly : it passed the highest mark, and fears were entertained that Alexandria itself would be inundated.

Removal of
the Nile-
gauge.

The Pagans consoled themselves for their disappointment by an indecent jest.

A.D. 390.
Destruction
of idols
throughout
Egypt.

The destruction of idols, commenced at Alexandria, extended itself throughout the whole of Egypt: the infamous secrets of their worship were discovered, the metal obtained from them recast into vessels for the use of the Church; and one image only retained, that of a ridiculous ape, lest in after times the heathen should deny their worship of such monsters. The wrath of Eunapius, a pagan writer, is excessive. He accuses Theophilus of changing the worship of the great gods into the adoration of miserable men who had suffered for their crimes, referring of course, to the honour shewn to the relics of the Martyrs; and asserts that the Bishop's private interest was at the bottom of his exertions against idolaters.

A.D. 389.

The schism of the Church of Antioch still continuing, the Council of Capua entrusted Theophilus with the final settlement of the matter; but Flavian, the same who was ordained by the Council of Constantinople, would not submit to his arbitration. It must be confessed that the Western Bishops interfered unwarrantably in this matter¹: they attempted to prejudice Theodosius against Flavian, by complaining of his tyranny; but the Emperor stood firm to that excellent Bishop, the patron of S. John Chrysostom, and the preserver of Antioch from the penalties which it had incurred by sedition.

A.D. 394.

We find Theophilus at a Council holden in Constantinople; on occasion of the consecration of the Church known by the name of the Apostolicon, and dedicated in honour of SS. Peter and Paul, to decide the dispute between Agapius and Bagadius, for the possession of the See of Bostra, the Metropolis of Arabia. In the course of the examinations, Theophilus, who presided with the Bishops of Constantinople and Antioch, gave it as his opinion, that although three Bishops could consecrate, they could not depose a Prelate, and that nothing less than a Provincial Council was sufficient for the latter act. This was approved by the Fathers then present.²

The errors of Origen, which had slumbered for so long a time, were now to occasion fresh trouble in the Church. A difference arose between John Bishop of Jerusalem, who was suspected of

¹ S. Ambrose, Ep. 56.

² Theod. Balsamon 390. Baronius vi. 151.

holding these tenets, and S. Epiphanius and S. Jerome ; and the angry feelings excited on both sides, before the death of Theodosius, brought forth bitter fruit subsequently to that event.

Epiphanius was a great admirer of Theophilus, and was drawn on by him to acts of which, had he lived, he would assuredly have repented. On the death of Nectarius of Constantinople, the Emperor Arcadius resolved to supply his place by S. John Chrysostom of Antioch ; and to render his consecration the more solemn, he convoked a Council on the occasion. Theophilus had designed a Priest of his own,¹ named Isidore, to fill the chair of the imperial city : and the reason assigned for this desire is, if true, not a little discreditable to both. In the war between Theodosius and Maximus, Isidore had been entrusted by Theophilus with two letters, charged with which he awaited the event at Rome. The one was a congratulation to be delivered to Maximus, in case his forces should prove victorious ; the other was to be given to Theodosius, if success should declare in his favour. Having formed this design, it was natural that the Alexandrian Patriarch should be opposed to the election of S. Chrysostom ; and personal intercourse did not diminish his unwillingness to officiate, as his office rendered it necessary for him to do, at the consecration of the new Prelate. Eutropius, the then powerful prime minister, on hearing of the opposition of Theophilus, took a summary method of putting an end to it. Taking him aside, he shewed him a large quantity of documents, carefully preserved. "These," he said, "are memorials received at different times from several of your Bishops against your proceedings ; your choice is free, either to consecrate John of Antioch, or to defend yourself against these accusations." Theophilus chose the former alternative. This account too clearly shews the closeness of that dangerous embrace with which, at Constantinople, the State had already clasped the Church.

Theophilus
again at
Constanti-
nople :

A. D. 393.

he con-
secrates
S. John
Chrysostom.

At the same time we must remember that on this matter and the subsequent transactions connected with it, we are left for information almost entirely, so far as historical accounts are concerned, to writers prejudiced in favour of S. John Chrysostom. It cannot be denied that the latter, in common with S. Meletius, and the rest of the Antiochene school, had a tendency to ration-

¹ Socrat. H. E. vi. 2. Sozomen, H. E. viii. 2.

alizing views ;—a tendency from which, as we have observed, the national feeling of the Egyptian Church shrank with horror. We, in looking back on the whole course of events, are able to perceive that this tendency in S. Chrysostom's mind was left in check by his piety and the authority of the Church : but Theophilus had no guarantee at that time, that it would not result in semi-Arian, or even Arian tenets. Doubtless his desire of placing a Priest of his own in the chair of Constantinople, had much influence on his conduct : but it were uncharitable not to allow that he might not unreasonably be prejudiced against a Priest of S. Flavian, who had been elevated to the Throne of Antioch in spite of a most solemn compact, and who undoubtedly represented the Arianizing portion of the Catholic Church in that city.

A.D. 399. In the next year the Secs of Alexandria and Constantinople re-established communion between Flavian of Antioch and the Church of Rome.¹ But this harmony between S. Chrysostom and Theophilus was not of long continuance.

A.D. 400. Rufinus, the friend of S. Jerome, unfortunately at this time published a translation of Origen's work *on principles*, hinting in his introduction that Jerome had approved it ; that Father wrote against Rufinus, and strongly condemned the doctrine of Origen. The tenets of the latter were condemned at Rome, and generally in the West ; Theophilus had already set the example. The hasty tempers of S. Epiphanius and S. Jerome accused the See of Alexandria of too great tolerance for heretics ; and a circumstance occurred which quickened the proceedings of Theophilus.

The Ori-
genian
controversy
revives :

The errors and doctrines of Origen had for many years ceased to occupy a prominent place in public interest. The Arian controversy had concentrated on itself all the polemical theology of the Church ; and while that lasted, no other heresy, not even the Apollinarian, could excite more than a passing investigation. But the writings of Origen had made their way into the Monasteries of Egypt, and there found readers who were not engrossed by the all-prevailing topic of Arianism, and the mystical temperament of whose minds disposed them to adopt the opinions of that extraordinary man. Men, who dwelt in the furthest

¹ Sozomen, II. E. viii. 1.

recesses of the desert, who passed months together without the sight of a stranger, who had wild crags and interminable wildernesses for their companions, who were familiarized with the sublimity of a mountain noon-tide, and the awful beauty of a tropical night, these men, we say, must have been peculiarly susceptible to the impressions of nature, and peculiarly willing to see or to imagine the links which unite visible nature with the invisible world. Hence they eagerly received the wild theories of Origen on Angelical natures, the origin of spirits, the essence of stars, and the like mystical visions; and hence, when the word Origenian became a term of reproach, Egypt was plunged in endless disputes. For, though undoubtedly the public tendency was to the mysticism of that writer, few owned themselves his partisans, and some among the Monasteries were declared enemies to his name and doctrines. Foremost among these were a set of heretics who at this time appeared in Egypt,¹ and interpreted literally those passages of Scripture where the different members of the human body are attributed to the Deity. They thence acquired the name of Anthropomorphites; they were for the most part ignorant monks, and violently opposed to Origen, as from his attachment to the mystical significations of Holy Writ, the most diametrically opposed of all Christian writers to their own dogmas. They went further, and branded the Catholics with the title of Origenians.

Theophilus, in his usual Paschal letter, took occasion to combat this heresy, which he did with great clearness and by solid proofs. His Epistle was received by the Monks with an outcry of indignation. Those of Seete, reputed the most perfect in Egypt, would not allow it to be read; their Abbat Paphnutius was the only person in the monastery who received its doctrine as sound. Serapion, who possessed great authority among the brotherhood, from his age, his austerities, and his exemplary life, was in vain told by Paphnutius that the passages he quoted were to be taken in a spiritual sense. It happened opportunely that Photinus, a Deacon of Cappadocia, well esteemed for his learning, visited the monastery: and from him Paphnutius learnt that the Eastern Church explained the texts in question

Theophilus declares against the Anthropomorphites. A.D. 401.

¹ Socrat. H. E. vi. 7. Sozomen, H. E. viii. 11.

as he himself had done. This concurrence of testimony overcame the obstinacy of Serapion ; the poor old man burst into tears, exclaiming, "They have taken away my God, and I know not what to worship !" The greater part of the Monks were not so easy to be convinced. They came in a crowd to Alexandria, exclaiming against Theophilus as a heretic and a blasphemer. If, they cried, he is not implicated in the errors of Origen, why does he not anathematize them ? The Bishop, desirous of restoring peace to his Church, promised to do so ; and in a Council which he shortly after assembled, he fulfilled his engagement. In his next Paschal letter, he took occasion to dwell at length on the subject ; and in some instances, appears to have dealt unfairly with the expressions of Origen. The Paschal letters, in which Theophilus attacked these errors, are now only known to us through the Latin version of S. Jerome.¹

Theophilus
attacks
Isidore :

A dispute arose about this time at Alexandria, which was destructive of the peace of the whole Eastern Church. An aged priest named Isidore, who had been ordained by S. Athanasius, was master of the Hospital in that city : and as his charity was well known, he was presented with a thousand pieces of gold by a rich widow, engaging himself by oath to expend the money in clothing the poorest women of the city. The donor was unwilling to entrust the sum to Theophilus, because his passion for building was notorious : and she feared that he would employ the money in increasing the principal Church, already too large. The Bishop heard of the transaction, and though indignant with Isidore, was unable at the time to punish the affront he imagined himself to have received. But shortly afterwards, he called his Priests together, and in their presence, put a paper into the hand of Isidore, informing him that it was a memorial presented eighteen years before against him, and desiring him to answer it. Isidore represented the injustice of requiring him to defend himself when no accuser was present ; and Theophilus, after shuffling for some time, promised that on another day the plaintiff should be forthcoming. He soon, by a bribe, prevailed on a young man to undertake the character ; but the transaction came to the ears of Isidore ; and Theophilus, perceiving his scheme to be discovered, excommunicated that Priest, on pre-

¹ S. Hieronym. Epp. 96, 98, 100.

tence of a heinous crime committed by him. His victim took refuge in the monastery on Mount Nitria, where he had been brought up. Theophilus commanded the neighbouring Bishops to drive the principal Monks from their retreat, without assigning any cause. Four brothers, known by the surname of the Long, Ammonius, Dioscorus, Eusebius, and Euthymius, men of great learning and reputation among the Monks, presented themselves at Alexandria, conjuring their Prelate to inform them wherein they had offended him: but they received the grossest insults, and were taunted with vague accusations of Origenianism. Theophilus went farther; he prevailed on five Monks whom he selected from Mount Nitria, by bestowing on them Ecclesiastical preferment, to accuse their brethren, and to sign memorials which he had himself composed. Fortified with these documents, he obtained the assistance of the civil power in dispossessing the Monks of their mountain: and they retired, to the number of three hundred, into the surrounding provinces. Fifty of them, whom with others, to the number of eighty, the malice of Theophilus had pursued into Palestine, sought refuge at Constantinople; and casting themselves at the feet of S. John Chrysostom, implored his protection against the unprincipled attack of Theophilus.¹

banishes the
Long brothers,

and other
Monks :

S. Chrysostom acted in this affair with great prudence. He learnt, no less from the statement of the Monks themselves, than from the confession of some clerks of Theophilus, then at Constantinople, that great wrong had been done them; at the same time, he was unwilling to come to an open rupture with the Bishop of Alexandria, not only for the sake of preserving the peace of the Church, but because his own station was at this time, through the machinations and violence of the Arians, exceedingly insecure. He therefore lodged the fugitives in the buildings attached to the Church of the Resurrection; yet, while he allowed them to perform their devotions in it, and took care that their wants should be amply supplied, he would not admit them to his communion.

the Long
brothers at
Constanti-
nople :

In the mean time he wrote to Theophilus, beseeching him, from friendship to himself, his spiritual son, to receive them. In reply, Theophilus despatched the five monks whom he had

¹ Sozomen, H. E. viii. 10.

suborned, and their accusations were laid before S. Chrysostom. The exiled Monks, now thoroughly aroused, drew up a memorial of the violence they had suffered, and appended to it several grave accusations against their Bishop. Chrysostom wrote in more urgent terms to Theophilus, and received an angry answer, to the effect, that the Canons of Nicæa forbade one Bishop to interfere with the concerns of another; that if the See of Alexandria was to be tried, a Synod of its own Bishops was the proper judge: and that the Bishop of Constantinople, at so great a distance, could in no case be a proper authority. S. Chrysostom, thus finding interference useless, contented himself with general exhortations to peace, and let the matter rest. Theophilus, on the contrary, was determined that it should not sleep. He had at one time regarded S. Epiphanius as an Anthropomorphite; but he was now glad to avail himself of his authority.¹ Knowing his hatred of Origenianism, he requested him to assemble the Bishops of Cyprus, to condemn the errors of that system, and then to send its Synodal letter to S. Chrysostom. For, he hinted, the Bishop of Constantinople was not thoroughly opposed to them; as he had evinced by giving shelter to certain Egyptian monks condemned for holding them, who had taken refuge with him. At the same time, he wrote to S. Chrysostom, exhorting him to convene a Council for the same purpose.

Theophilus
obtains the
assistance
of Epipha-
nius,

A.D. 402.

S. Epiphanius, having done as he was requested, brought the acts of the Cyprian Council in person to Constantinople;² where he would not hold communion with Chrysostom, who had proposed to receive him with great honour. The four Fathers whom we have previously mentioned, not contented with the manner in which their cause was espoused by S. Chrysostom, presented a memorial to the Emperor, against Theophilus, and the latter was required to present himself at Constantinople for the purpose of justifying his proceedings. He did so; and the result was very different from that which the parties interested in promoting his arrival had expected.

and goes to
Constanti-
nople.

Theophilus brought with him many Egyptian Bishops: and some from India,³ by which Abyssinia is probably meant. He was lodged for three weeks in one of the palaces of the Emperor:

¹ Sozomen, II. E. viii. 11. ² Socrates, II. E. vi. 12. ³ Socrates, II. E. vi. 11.

and during the whole of that time pointedly abstained from every mark of communion with S. Chrysostom. The contrast between the behaviour of the two Prelates to each other was indeed remarkable. Chrysostom, although the Monks importuned him continually to do them justice, would not take cognizance of an affair out of his own province; on the contrary, Theophilus wrought night and day to effect the destruction of his rival. Nor was he alone in his endeavours. The reform brought to pass by S. Chrysostom in his Church, had of course raised many enemies against him: already a deputation had been sent to Antioch, in the hope of discovering some fault of his youth, for which he might be deposed,—but to no purpose; Acacius, Bishop of Beræa, was incensed against him, and some Priests and Deacons, and a few ladies of consideration, at court, whom Chrysostom had reproved for their love of dress, and their false hair, were eager to revenge themselves upon him. Theophilus kept open house for all the discontented, lavished his money where he thought it necessary, promised promotion to those who should remain faithful to him, and even engaged to restore two Deacons to their rank, one deprived for adultery, the other for murder, if he should succeed in his project.¹

He then drew up a memorial to himself, which he caused to be signed by his partisans: it contained a number of false accusations, and only one true charge, which, even if proved, was immaterial. The Empress Eudoxia was won over to the side of the malcontents; and by her means they doubted not that the Emperor would lend a favourable ear to their representations.

Matters being thus ripe, Theophilus passed over to Chalcedon; the Bishop of that place, Cyrinus, an Egyptian, was known to be an enemy of S. Chrysostom, and was unable, from an accidental wound, to cross the strait to Constantinople. A Council of Synod of the Oak: forty-five Bishops, of whom thirty-six were Egyptian, were assembled in a suburb of Chalcedon, known by the name of the Oak: and twenty-nine articles of accusation were presented against S. Chrysostom. He on the other hand assembled a Council of forty Bishops in the hall of the Bishop's house. The

¹ The prejudiced account which Baronius gives of the whole affair, is one of the greatest blemishes in this part of his annals. His language with re-

spect to Sozomen and Socrates is as violent as his reasons for contradicting them (see 402 L.) are weak.

S. Chrysostom deposed and banished :

relation of this event belongs rather to the History of the Church of Constantinople; Theophilus triumphed, and S. Chrysostom was deposed. He was forthwith banished by the Emperor's orders, and carried over into Asia. His exile, however, only lasted a day. On the night of his banishment, an earthquake occurred, which Eudoxia regarded as a warning of the Divine anger. The people loudly exclaimed against the Emperor, and against Theophilus; orders were given for the recall of Chrysostom: there was a burst of popular joy when he crossed the strait; and though unwilling to re-enter the city till acquitted by a more numerous Council than that which had condemned him, he was constrained by the people to resume his ordinary episcopal functions. The sermon which he delivered on the occasion, in which he compares his Church to Sarah, and Theophilus to Pharaoh, is still extant.

he returns :

Theophilus flies.

In the mean time, the Council at the Oak were in no small danger from the violence of the people. Theophilus, finding that there was a project of throwing him into the sea, embarked in the middle of the night, and at the beginning of winter, when the navigation of the Mediterranean was dangerous, and hastened to Alexandria. He had previously reconciled himself with the two superiors of Mount Nitria, Eusebius and Euthymius, who were the only survivors of the four whom he had driven into exile. This very reconciliation, however, so easily effected, excited still more strongly popular indignation against Theophilus; and that the rather because, after all his opposition to the works of Origen, he did not himself desist from reading them. This inconsistency was pointed out to him. "The works of Origen," he replied, "are like a meadow, adorned with various kinds of flowers. If I find anything useful or beautiful, I gather it; if I light on anything poisonous, I pass it by."¹ Of the whole of this proceeding, so disgraceful to Theophilus, the Eastern historians say not one word.²

On his return, he wrote a long work against Chrysostom, in which the language is said to have been worthy of the design.³ We know it from the description given of it by Facundus. In the

¹ Le Quien, ii. 407A.

² Renaudot, p. 103. Eutychius, indeed, gives a slight account of a dispute between Alexandria and Con-

stantinople, but assigns an entirely false cause as its origin. (p. 535.)

³ Socrat. H. E. vi. 17.

final exile and persecution of S. Chrysostom, however, Theophilus A.D. 403. seems to have borne no part. Had the request of S. Innocent to Honorius for a general Council been attended with success, it is more than probable that the Bishop of Alexandria would have paid the penalty of his violence by his deposition. Yet it is fair to remember, that, had the grounds of S. Chrysostom's condemnation been just, Theophilus was only exercising an undoubted right in the deposition of a guilty Patriarch of Constantinople.

It is, however, but charitable to hope, that in the nine remaining years of his life, his repentance was sincere. And there are the more grounds for believing this, because of the willingness which he displayed, after the death of S. Chrysostom, to communicate with the Bishops of his party,¹ and his intercourse with the illustrious Synesius. Synesius was a native of Cyrene: Synesius Bishop of Ptolemais : he had studied philosophy at Alexandria, where he also married, Theophilus performing the ceremony. He gave himself up, on his return to his own country, to his studies, and to the pleasures of the chase:² but his reputation was so great that it was proposed to elevate him to the See of Ptolemais, which, as we have seen in the Introduction, was at this time invested with his Legantine authority : Metropolitcal, or rather Legantine dignity. To this he offered the greatest resistance, declaring, in the first place, that his faith on the subject of the Resurrection was not the same with that of the Church: and in the second, that he by no means proposed to himself to observe continence.³ Theophilus convinced him that, on the first point, his creed was essentially Catholic: and was content, in order to avail himself of his services, to overlook the second. And, in fact, this proceeding was fully justified by the event. Synesius became an excellent Prelate: and his letters, still extant, evince the respect and submission he entertained for the decisions of the Evangelical chair.

We have already mentioned that Siderius had, by S. Athanasius, been consecrated Bishop of the little town of Palæbisca. He had no successor: and the See was again united with that of Erythrum.⁴ Paul, Bishop of the latter place, was exceedingly beloved: but Theophilus, thinking it more for the interest his mission to Palæbisca : of the Church, that Palæbisca should once more be constituted

¹ See Baronius, 407. xxxvi.

² Synesius, Calvit. Encom. 66 D.

³ Synesius, Ep. 105. 246 D.

⁴ Synesius, Ep. 67. 208 A.

a separate Sec, despatched Synesius thither to arrange the matter. The inhabitants of Palæbisea, while professing the greatest respect for the decrees of the Sec of Alexandria, besought with the most pitiable entreaties that they might not be deprived of the watchful tenderness of Paul. Women held up their children to move compassion: and neither the promises nor the threats of the legate could prevail over their deep-rooted affection. He adjourned the assembly for four days; but the next meeting presented the same scene; and Synesius, quite overcome by the affection of these poor people, advised Theophilus not to insist on the point: and the latter consented.

But Synesius, on proper occasions, knew how to display the most determined firmness.¹ Andronicus of Berenice, a city of Pentapolis, having purchased his situation by bribery, used it to practise the most odious cruelties. He invented new instruments of torture: the hall of justice had become a mere place of punishment. The people complained to Synesius: and the latter warned the Governor, but uselessly, against the course he was pursuing. Andronicus, instead of paying any attention to this remonstrance, affixed to the doors of the church an edict against the Priests. At length, as Synesius requested him to set free a man of high birth, whom he was putting, without any pretext, to the torture, Andronicus exclaimed to his prisoner, "Your trust in the Church is hopeless: if you had clasped the knees of CHRIST Himself, He should not deliver you." Having heard this blasphemy, Synesius solemnly excommunicated its author, and announced this proceeding in a letter to all the Bishops of Pentapolis. Andronicus was terrified, and made a profession of penitence: Synesius did not believe him in earnest, but yielding to the persuasion of Bishops more experienced than himself, he re-admitted him to communion. The event justified his suspicions; Andronicus committed greater excesses than before; and was finally disgraced and imprisoned. Synesius interceded for him with the civil government, and procured the alleviation of his punishment.

his contest
with Andro-
nicus.

Theophilus
dies, Oct. 15,
A.D. 412.

In the next year, Theophilus fell sick of a lethargy, which proved to be mortal. Just before his death, he exclaimed, "Happy wert thou, Abbat Arsenius," (referring to one of the

¹ Synesius, Ep. 72. 218 C. Ep. 89. 230 D. Ep. 58. 201 B.

most illustrious of the Egyptian monks,) "to have had this hour constantly before thine eyes!"

So died Theophilus, in the twenty-eighth year of his episcopate. His faults are obvious to all, and admit of no defence. His ambition, his intolerance of opposition, his total want of principle, are displayed in his persecution of the Monks of Mount Nitria, and of S. Chrysostom. But he had also virtues, for which he was esteemed by his contemporaries, and held in honour after his death.¹ His care of his province was most exemplary: his orthodoxy was never questioned; his writings were afterwards appealed to as authorities; his ecclesiastical regulations were judicious. His Paschal Cycle was celebrated in antiquity.² He created several new Bishoprics: but is said neither to have been sufficiently careful of the character of those whom he consecrated, nor of the Canon which forbade the erection of a See in a hamlet or village. On the whole, he appears to have possessed most of the requisites for a good Bishop, except the most important of all,—personal piety.³

SECTION XXVII.

THE EARLY PONTIFICATE OF S. CYRIL.

ON the death of Theophilus, two claimants of the Chair of S. Mark appeared. The one was Timotheus, Archdeacon of Alexandria, who was supported by the influence of the Prefect; the other Cyril, brother's, or as the Arabian writers will have it, sister's,⁴ son to the deceased Bishop. The people were on the point of sedition: but at length the party of Cyril, providentially for the Church, prevailed.⁵ After a vacancy of three days, the neighbouring Prelates assembled,⁶ and laying the Gospels on

S. Cyril,
Pat. XXIV.
A.D. 412.
A.M. 1224.

¹ S. Leo, in one place, speaks of him as "Sanctæ memoriæ Theophilus": and in another, couples him with S. Athanasius and S. Cyril as "probatissimos præsules."

² Le Quien, ii. 407 A.

³ He is commemorated by the Coptic Church on the eighth day of October.

There is a curious passage in Sollerius, p. 52^a D, in which he seems to assert that the Bollandists had some idea that Theophilus possessed a claim to be placed in the Catalogue of the Saints.

⁴ Renaudot, p. 108.

⁵ Socrat. II. E. vii. 7.

⁶ Severus ap. Renaudot, p. 103.

the head of the Bishop elect, prayed over him, that God, Who had chosen him, would strengthen him with the virtue necessary for the well governing of His Holy Church.

His early
education :

Cyril had been brought up under Serapion, on Mount Nitria; he had early displayed great diligence in study : and is said to have known the New Testament by heart. It is the reproach of S. Isidore of Pelusium, in a letter addressed to him, that his thoughts were rather with the world than in the desert.¹ After five years' abode in Mount Nitria, his uncle summoned him to Alexandria, where he was ordained, and where he expounded and preached with great reputation. His favourite authors, if we may believe the Jacobite Severus, were S. Dionysius of Alexandria, S. Athanasius, S. Clement of Rome, and S. Basil. The works of Origen he held in abhorrence, and would neither read them himself, nor have any communication with those who did.

his great
authority.

The power of the Alexandrian Bishop was now very great : it is somewhat inconsistently, by writers of the Roman Communion, termed excessive :² and S. Cyril, from the first, seems to have determined that it should lose nothing in his hands. Indeed from the hasty and violent actions which distinguished the beginning of his episcopate, we should rather expect a repetition of the outrages of Theophilus, than,—in spite of whatever infidel or schismatical historians may choose to call it,—the noble defence of the perfect Divinity of our Redeemer, which has rendered his memory precious to the Church.

The See of Alexandria was not, at this time, in Communion with that of Rome : the Western Church had vindicated the character, and now revered the memory, of S. Chrysostom; Theophilus, on the other hand, and, following in his steps, Cyril, would not insert the name of that illustrious Prelate in the sacred diptychs ; that is, in the list of those Bishops who were commemorated in the office of the Holy Eucharist. And this state of things lasted for several years.

he attacks
the Nova-
tians,

Cyril's two earliest acts were by no means worthy of his character or of his dignity. He not only closed the churches of the Novatians, but deprived them of their vessels and treasures, and confiscated the property of Theopemptus, the Bishop of that

¹ S. Isid. Pel. Ep. i. 25.

“ Alexandrini Patriarchæ auctoritas
Egypti Ecclesiæ extitit.”

² See the § in Le Quien, ii. 362,

sect. He next exerted himself against the Jews; and certainly not without great provocation. Hierax, one of his most zealous auditors, was in the theatre, while the Governor was transacting in that place some civil business.¹ The Jews who were present cried out, that he came for the purpose of exciting sedition. A.D. 415. Orestes, the Governor, had long been offended at the enormous power assumed by the Bishop, and the more so, as it encroached on his own: he was glad therefore of any excuse for venting his anger on Cyril, and having arrested Hierax, caused him to be scourged publicly on the spot. Cyril sent for the principal persons among the Jews, threatened them severely, and charged them to beware how they again excited popular feeling against the Christians. The Jews, in their turn indignant, concerted a general massacre of their adversaries; and, on an appointed night, having taken care previously to distinguish themselves so as to be easily recognizable by each other, gave the alarm in all quarters of the city at once, that the great church was on fire. The Christians rushed forth in large numbers to give their assistance: the Jews fell upon them, and despatched not a few. On the following day, Cyril, with a large body of his adherents, and the corporation of the Parabolani, whose office it was to visit the sick and Jews in time of plague or other mortality, and who were thus familiarized with scenes of horror, attacked their synagogues, drove the Jews themselves out of the city, and gave up their houses to a general sack. Orestes was justly indignant that Cyril should thus have taken the law into his own hands: and was besides fearful that the commercial prosperity of the city would receive a blow from the compulsory exile of so many of its inhabitants. He drew up a representation of the case for the Emperor's consideration; and the Bishop forwarded a counter-memorial. But the latter some short time afterwards, His quarrel with Orestes. probably thinking that he had carried matters with too high a hand, requested to be reconciled with Orestes; the latter obstinately refused. The Monks of Nitria, hearing this, came in a crowd to the city, and attacked the Governor in his chariot; and one of them, named Ammonius, wounded him severely with a stone. The culprit was arrested, condemned, and executed; Cyril ordered that his name should be changed to Thaumasi-
us.

¹ Soerat. H.E. vii. 26, 13, and Valesius's note.

(*admirable*,) and that he should be honoured as a Martyr. But the more sober part of his people were opposed to the step : and in the course of a few years, Cyril himself was glad to let this monstrous canonization sink into oblivion.

Murder of
Hypatia :

It would have been well had matters stopped here. But the people, imagining that a lady of high birth, celebrated as one of the first philosophers of the day, and the correspondent of Synesius, named Hypatia, was the chief hindrance to the reconciliation of Orestes with their Bishop, attacked her, headed by one Peter, a reader, in the street, dragged her into the Cæsarea, tore her in pieces, and burnt her remains in a public place. This audacious crime deservedly threw a dark cloud over the reputation of Cyril, which was not dispersed for some time ; and was the occasion of a severe law from Constantinople, to prevent for the future the like excesses, as well as to restrain the number of the Parabolani, and to deprive the Patriarch of their nomination.

The name of S. Chrysostom was inserted in the diptychs about this time, first at Antioch, and then at Constantinople ; Atticus, Bishop of the latter See, wrote to Cyril, excusing himself for the act, and exhorting him to imitate it. Cyril blamed what had been done, and positively refused to follow the example of the other great Sees. S. Isidore of Pelusium, hearing of this, wrote in strong terms to Cyril, exhorting him not to imitate the passionate violence of his uncle, nor to let private hatred, under the mask of piety, entail a perpetual schism on the Churches. The other yielded to this remonstrance, and, it is said, to a supernatural vision : and thus Alexandria came once more into Communion with Rome.¹

S. Cyril in
communion
with Rome,
A.D. 419.

The Pelagian heresy made but few converts at Alexandria ; and S. Cyril therefore took no prominent part in defending the Doctrine of Divine Grace. He was principally employed in the quiet government of the Church, and in the composition of some of his voluminous writings. Among these we may mention the earliest of his Paschal Homilies, of which we have twenty-nine, from A.D. 414 to A.D. 442 :² his seventeen books on "Worship in

¹ Nic. 14, 28. Baronius, 412, lxiii. It seems better to refer the reception of the name of S. Chrysostom, with Theophanes, to the year 419 : although some have placed it seven years earlier ;

and some two years later. See Baron. 412, xxiv : and Bolland. Jan. 8, S. Atticus, viii.

² See Aubert, Prolegom. Op. S. Cyril, v. ii.

Spirit and in Truth," his *Glaphyra*, or commentary on the Pentateuch; and those on Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, and S. John. He also confuted the treatise of Julian the Apostate against Christianity: and the remark which Severus makes on this subject is an amusing proof how little dependance can be placed on his accounts. Julian's treatise, says he, was worse than the writings of Origen or Porphyry; which is the same thing as if an historian of the present day were to declare that the works of Voltaire were more dangerous than those of Bishop Taylor or Gibbon.

It would seem that years were necessary to mellow down the spirit of S. Cyril, before he could be a fit instrument in the Hand of God for the maintenance of the Faith, in the great contest to which he was to be called.

Egyptian monasticism still maintained its high sanctity: and continued to produce recluses whose names are had in veneration by the whole Church. Of these, Arsenius, the same who was envied by the dying Theophilus, stood forth at this time the most illustrious. A Deacon of the Roman Church, he had been entrusted with the education of the young Arcadius: and having irritated the Prince by inflicting on him corporal punishment, escaped to Alexandria, and at length took refuge in the desert of Scete, where he received the apologies and forgave the anger, of Arcadius. Here he dwelt for forty years, distinguished above all other monks by his love of solitude. When that part of Egypt was ravaged by the barbarians, he retired into another wilderness: where he lived fifteen years longer.

Egyptian
Monasti-
cism.

It is a strange and almost incredible picture that Cassian draws, who visited the most celebrated Egyptian monasteries towards the close of the fourth century. On the mountains of S. Antony five thousand monks followed his example, and venerated his memory. Near Hermopolis, S. Apollonius was charged with the spiritual conduct of five hundred recluses: S. Isidore, in the Thebais, with that of a thousand. At Antinöus, Dioseorus instructed twice that number: five thousand occupied the Desert of Nitria: five hundred that of Cells. The Rule of Tabenna was followed in most of the Egyptian monasteries: twice a year the monks met, or, as it would afterwards have been termed, held a chapter of their order: at Easter, and in August; and the Easter Communion was sometimes attended by fifty thousand

Cassian
visits the
Monaste-
ries.

monks. These monasteries consisted, for the most part, of about thirty houses: each house contained a certain number of brethren, generally about forty, who all wrought at the same trade: and these were distributed by three and three in cells. The houses were distinguished by the letters of the alphabet, and the inmates of the house wore that letter worked on their habit. Three or four houses formed a tribe,—that is, a body that during one week took, in turns, the manual labour, the more immediate service of the Church, and every other branch of monastic discipline. Their usual food was biscuit and water: of the latter they took two of six ounces each, one at three in the afternoon, the other at sunset. This quantity of food was not easily eaten by the novices, but was found necessary, after long trial. On Festivals, the first meal was taken at noon: but no alteration was made in the quantity or quality of the food.

They met for prayer at night-fall, and at midnight. It consisted of twelve Psalms, recited by one of their number, standing, the rest sitting on low stools; for their labours and fastings did not permit them to stand. At the end of each Psalm, they rose, continued awhile in mental prayer, prostrated themselves for a moment, and again sat. To the Psalms were added two lessons, one from the Old, and one from the New Testament: except on Saturday, Sunday, and in the Paschal Season, when they were both from the New Testament. They communicated on Saturday and Sunday morning: on other mornings they did not meet for prayer, but continued at work in their cells, and engaged in mental devotion.

But the nearest approach to Heaven which was ever made by the Church Militant, was to be found at Oxyrinchus. It was a large city: but the monks and consecrated virgins formed the greater part of the population. The number of the former was ten, of the latter twenty thousand. There was neither heretic nor Pagan in this city. It contained, besides the oratories of the recluses, twelve churches: the praise of God continually resounded in its streets; and by the order of the magistrates, there were police continually on the look out for the poor and the strange, who were constantly supplied and lodged by the wealthier citizens.

BOOK II.

FROM

THE RISE OF THE NESTORIAN HERESY,

A.D. 428,

TO THE DEPOSITION OF DIOSCORUS,

AND THE GREAT SCHISM,

A.D. 451.

Βλέπω τὰ θαύματα, καὶ ἀνακηρύττω τὴν Θεότητα· ὁρῶ τὰ πάθη, καὶ οὐκ ἄρνοῦμαι τὴν Ἀνθρωπότητα. Ἀλλ' ὁ Ἐμμανουὴλ φύσεως μὲν πύλας ἀνέωξεν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, παρθενίας δὲ κλειῖθρα οὐ διέβριξεν ὡς Θεὸς· ἀλλ' οὕτως ἐκ μήτρας ἐξῆλθεν, ὡς δι' ἀκοῆς εἰσῆλθεν· οὕτως ἐγεννήθη, ὡς συνελήφθη· ἀπαθῶς εἰσῆλθεν, ἀφθόρτως ἐξῆλθε.

S. PROCLUS, Homilia in Incarnationem Verbi.

SECTION I.

NESTORIUS PREACHES AND DEFENDS HIS HERESY.

WE now approach the critical period of Alexandrian History. We shall see the Church of Egypt, in the brief space of twenty-three years, stand forth the foremost champion of Catholic Truth, and its deadliest enemy;—we shall see it overthrowing rationalism, and succumbing to mysticism: we shall find it at length rent into two opposing Communion, both continuing to this day, and thenceforth declining, till the second See in the Christian Church sunk to an unassignable position among Catholic Bodies, till its succession of Patriarchs has become little more than a name, and the region once so illustrious for Bishops and Martyrs, is almost swallowed up by the doctrines of the False Prophet of Mecca.

We are bound therefore to dwell more minutely on the two controversies which distracted the Church concerning the Incarnation of the Son of God, than we did on that, which while its subject-matter may be held of more importance, left no trace behind it;—the Arian heresy. It would seem as if rationalism, in its strong-hold, Antioch, unable longer to deny the True Divinity of the Word, sought another outlet whereby it might trouble the Church. Of the rise of the new heresy we are now to write: and it will be necessary for awhile to leave Alexandria, that we may trace the controversy to its source.¹

Sisinnius, the successor of S. Atticus on the Throne of Constantinople, departed this life, after a Pontificate of less than two years, on the twenty-fourth day of December, A.D. 427.² The choice of his successor was a question of much difficulty. A large number of the clergy were in favour of Proclus, the Metropolitan of Cyzicum, who is reckoned among the Saints; but Philip, a Presbyter of the Church of Constantinople, had

Disputed
succession at
Constanti-
nople.

¹ It is hardly necessary to say how much, in the first half of the following book, we are indebted to the learning

and diligence of Garnier, in his invaluable edition of Marius Mercator.

² Soerat. H. E. vii. 26.

also his partizans, and there seemed but little likelihood that the contending factions would be able to agree in the election. Theodosius, desirous of composing the difference by the nomination of a third party, cast his eyes for that purpose on the Church of Antioch; both because its Presbyters were at that time celebrated for learning and eloquence; and doubtless also because the memory of S. John Chrysostom seemed to render such a choice popular and full of promise.

Character of
Nestorius.

Among the clergy of Antioch, Nestorius had the highest reputation. A native of the little town of Germanicia, he had embraced the monastic life in the house of S. Euprepus near Antioch. On entering the Priesthood, he was made Catechist of the Church of that city: and in that capacity was noted for the facility with which he exposed and combated the heresies of the day. He had studied under Theodore of Mopsuestia; and was imbued by him with those unsound principles of rationalising tendency which, a century earlier, might have made him a ready disciple of Arius, but which now, without at present assuming, either in his master or in himself, any very definite form, floated round and obscured the Doctrine of the Incarnation. His learning was not deep: but his asceticism, his solitary life, his decisive and dogmatical manner, and above all, his great power of extempore eloquence, rendered him the admiration of the citizens of Antioch. He was an imitator of S. Chrysostom in his style and sentiments, and employed himself principally, and with sufficient effect, in attacking the Arian and Apollinarian heresies.

It has been the fashion to regard him as a man who, having thoroughly digested his own system, simulated asceticism, and affected piety, for the sake of attaining an eminence whence he might propagate and support it. But it is unnecessary to attribute any such well-formed plan to one who, in truth, seems neither to have been possessed of talent nor powers of dissimulation, to render it effectual. It is sufficient to regard him as weak, and ambitious, but as much inferior to Arius in power as superior to him in morality; one who regarded the orthodox with a great degree of contempt, as illogical and superstitious; and who was determined, if the occasion should present itself, to propagate those purer and more enlightened principles which he believed himself to possess.

On receiving the Emperor's summons to Constantinople, he chose for his companion Anastasius, a fellow Priest, who was imbued with the same sentiments as himself, and of whose assistance he afterwards availed himself. His nomination was popular; and he was consecrated amidst a large concourse of Prelates, Priests, and Laity. A speech which he shortly afterwards made in public to Theodosius, was considered at least as derogatory from his humility as expressive of his zeal. "Give me, O Emperor," he exclaimed, "a world freed from heresy, and I will bestow on you the Kingdom of Heaven as your reward. Assist me in quelling heretics; and I will assist you in putting the Persians to flight."

He is consecrated
Patriarch,
April 10,
A.D. 428.

Nor did his somewhat intemperate zeal confine itself to words. Only five days after his consecration, he demolished a church of the Arians. Its possessors set fire to it; the flames spread; and had not the wind providentially changed, that quarter of the city would have been reduced to ashes. The populace, from this circumstance, bestowed on their Prelate the name of "the incendiary," and the fact was afterwards remembered and commented on. He attacked with similar violence Macedonians, Pelagians, and Novatians; and shortly afterwards procured a law from the Emperor against all heretics. A deed of at least equal merit was his extinguishing the last spark of hatred against the memory of S. John Chrysostom, whose name, though precious among the citizens of Constantinople, had up to this time been regarded with jealousy and dislike by the Court.

His violent
zeal :
April 15.

May 30.

Whatever might have been the opinions, and the general system of Nestorius, his orthodoxy seems to have been unsuspected for seven months after his ordination. A circumstance then occurred which brought him into direct collision with the implicit teaching of the Church.

Anastasius, the Presbyter whom we have already mentioned, preaching in the great church, and in the presence of Nestorius, asserted that the Blessed Virgin Mary had no right to the title of Mother of God: for, said he, she was a human creature, and Deity cannot be born of humanity. A tumult instantly arose in the church, and the preacher was compelled to pause; on which a Bishop, Dorotheus by name, and one of the most intimate friends of Nestorius, rose in his place, and said, in a

Anastasius
first teaches
that S. Mary
is not the
Mother of
God.
November
22.

loud voice, "If any man affirm Mary to be the Mother of God, let him be anathema." Nestorius, in the increasing confusion, shewed by his silence that he approved the new doctrine; and, not content with thus negatively supporting it, he prepared to uphold it by most vigorous measures.¹

Nestorius
vindicates
the new
heresy:
Dec. 25.

On Christmas Day, the great church, as usual, was thronged with worshippers; and Nestorius openly stood forward the patron of the new heresy.² After a few common-place observations on the general providence of God, he proceeded to dwell on the Incarnation as its most wonderful display. Man, he observed, the image of Divine Nature, had been attacked and corrupted by the devil: for man, he proceeded (using a metaphor happy from its appositeness to the then state of things), the King of Kings grieved, as for a violated statue of his own, and by forming a nature, without human seed, in the womb of the Virgin, brought to pass by a man the restoration of humanity.

"Hath God," he continued, "a Mother? Then may we excuse Paganism for giving mothers to their divinities. Then was Paul a liar when he testified concerning CHRIST, that He was "without father, without mother, without descent." No: Mary was not the Mother of God. For "that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." A creature brought not forth Him Who is uncreated; the FATHER begat not of the Virgin an Infant God, the WORD; for in the beginning was the WORD, as John saith: a creature bore not the Creator, but rather a Man who was the organ of Deity. For the HOLY GHOST created not God the SON: and 'that which is conceived in her, is of the HOLY GHOST'; but He fabricated of the Virgin a Temple, wherein God the WORD should dwell. God was incarnate, but never died; yea, rather elevated him in whom He was incarnate: He descended to raise that which had fallen, but He fell not Himself. On account of the employer, then, I venerate the vestment

¹ This account seems to be, as Garnier thinks it, the best way of reconciling two opposing stories—the one of Socrates, (H. E. vii. 32,) that Anastasius first preached the new heresy: the other of S. Cyril, (Epist. ad Acacium,) that Dorotheus first propagated it, and that with an anathema.

² A translation of the sermon, or rather of an abridgement of it, is given by Marius Mercator, (Opp. Ed. Garnier, P. ii. p. 5.)

which He employed : on account of that which is concealed, I adore that which appears."

The horror which these doctrines occasioned were so excessive, that, even in the presence of that august assembly, there were not wanting some who openly expressed their indignation. A monk was bold enough to oppose the celebration, by Nestorius, of the Holy Mysteries ; and, as the reward of his zeal, he was publicly scourged, and driven into exile. Yet this violence was without effect on the popular mind ; and the greater part of the pious inhabitants of Constantinople abstained from the communion of their patriarch.

At the commencement of the following year, Nestorius delivered his second sermon in defence of his dogma. The moderation of tone in the second, as compared with the first sermon, is remarkable ; and the same observation is also applicable to the third, delivered a few days subsequently, possibly on the Feast of the Epiphany.

his second
sermon :
January 1,
A.D. 429.

In this discourse, while he applauds the piety and reverence of his flock, he severely rebukes them for their want of a proper knowledge of God. From hence, he proceeds to establish the two Natures of CHRIST, on which his sentiments are sufficiently orthodox and temperate ; and then dilates on the Scriptural argument, which he conceived to lie against His One Person. It is never, he observes, said in the Gospel that God was born, or that God died : the term employed on such occasions is JESUS, or CHRIST, or LORD. This point he endeavours at length to establish ; and, singularly enough, in the course of his argument, he reveals how low were his views on the subject of the Holy Eucharist. His conclusion is this :—"Say of Him That assumed, that He is God ; and of that which was assumed, that it was the form of a servant. Then infer the dignity of the union, because the authority of the two is common—because the dignity of the two is the same ; and while the natures remain separate, confess the oneness of their conjunction."

his third :
Jan. 6.

The seventeenth Paschal Epistle of S. Cyril was read, as the custom was, on the Feast of the Epiphany. It is certain, therefore, that if the first sermon of Nestorius were delivered on the preceding Christmas Day, S. Cyril would not have seen it ; but he might very well have heard of the occurrences at the end of

XVII. Pas-
chal Epistle
of S. Cyril :
January 6.

November, and of the anathema then pronounced by Dorotheus. It is not wonderful, then, that he should devote the homily to a discussion of the Doctrine of the Incarnation. It must be confessed that, in some of his statements, the writer goes to the very verge of Catholic truth; and it is almost necessary to receive them with a tacit explanation of his words in an orthodox sense. Among these passages, his explanation of the text, "JESUS increased in wisdom and stature," stands pre-eminent.¹ The name of Nestorius, and all allusions to Constantinople, are suppressed.

In that city a spirit of determined opposition was also awakened; and, as has been so often the case in a holy cause, it began with the laity, and, through Monks and Priests, finally communicated itself to Bishops. Eusebius, then an advocate at Constantinople, afterwards Bishop of Dorylæum, put forth a short pamphlet, in which he accused Nestorius of renewing the heresy of Paul of Samosata. "I conjure those who shall read these lines"—thus the writer commences it,—“by the Most Holy TRINITY, to communicate it to all Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Readers, and laymen, residing in Constantinople, to the evident confusion of the heretic Nestorius, as evincing him to hold the sentiments of Paul of Samosata, condemned a hundred and sixty years since by Catholic Bishops.”

While this composition was the principal topic of conversation in the city, Marius Mercator, a resident in Constantinople, and a man of considerable power in religious controversy, brought out a pamphlet on “the difference between the heresy of Nestorius, and those of Paul of Samosata, Ebion, Photinus, and Marcellus;” and this treatise was also conducive towards the exposure of the new teaching. By degrees, the Priests took up the defence of the faith; and one or two who had ventured in the church of S. Irene-next-the-Sea, to inveigh against Nestorius, were, by his authority, silenced. “We have an Emperor,” exclaimed the populace, “but no Bishop.” Complaints were brought forward in all quarters against the Patriarch: he was charged with want of charity towards the poor, covetousness, and in-

Eusebius attacks Nestorius:

about January 15.

and is followed by Marius Mercator, about January 22.

Discontent at Constantinople. About February 15.

¹ S. Cyril, Opp. v. ii. 230 B. It is singular that Garnier, contrary to the date affixed by this letter to Easter,

should place it in A.D. 430. Pagi remarks this also, 429. xiv. Fleury xxv. 8.

dolence ; and threats were heard of casting into the sea one who had now manifested himself to be a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Nestorius, alarmed at the turn which affairs were taking, threw himself on the Emperor's protection ; and Theodosius took care to repress by an exertion of his authority, the murmurs of the people.

The Festival of the Annunciation drew on ; and Proclus, whom we have already mentioned as one of the candidates for the Throne of Constantinople, was appointed to preach on that day. He had been consecrated Metropolitan of Cyzicum by Sisinnius : but the clerks of that church claimed the election, and would not admit the Patriarch's nominee. Proclus therefore resided at Constantinople as a Priest attached to the great church : and his eloquence pointed him out as an appropriate preacher to address so numerous an audience on so august an occasion. Nestorius was present in person : and it is easy to judge what his feelings must have been when Proclus delivered his magnificent oration on "the Virgin Mother of God" : an oration which, if we except a few homilies of S. John Chrysostom, finds no match in the treasures of Oriental Theology. It was the Festival of the Virgin, he said, that had called that assembly together ;—that Virgin to whom earth and ocean emulously offered their best and their noblest gifts ; she who was typified by the bush that burnt with fire, and was not consumed :—the Mother and the Maiden,—the Bridge from God to man ;—in whose womb the incircumscribed God found an habitation ; who embraced Him Whom the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain. "God," continued the orator, "was born of a woman, but not mere God :—man was born of her,—but not man unmixed : and He made the gate of ancient sin the gate of safety, and where the Serpent by disobedience had diffused his poison, the Word, by obedience, formed a living Temple. Be not, O man, ashamed of that Birth ;—it was the means of thy Salvation. If God had not been born, He could not have died ; if He had not died He could not have destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. It is no injury to the architect to remain in the building which he himself has raised ; it is no pollution to the potter to renew the clay which he himself has formed ; it contaminates not the In-

S. Proclus
preaches on
the Incar-
nation.
March 25.

contaminable to proceed from the Womb of the Virgin. In that Womb the deed of our common liberty was engrossed; in that Womb the panoply against death was fabricated. There, as in a Temple, God was made a Priest;—not changing the nature that He had, but out of compassion putting on that which is after the order of Melchisedech. *The Word was made Flesh*, although the Jews believe not the truth; God put on the form of man, though the Pagans deny the miracle: and for this cause the Mystery is *to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness*. If the WORD had never dwelt in the womb, Flesh could never have ascended the Throne. If God had abhorred to enter the Virgin, it had been an injury to the Angels to minister to man. We speak not of a deified man; we confess an Incarnate God. He That is in his essence without a Mother, is in the earthly economy of grace without a Father; or else how shall we say with Paul, *without father, without mother?* If He be purely man, He is not without a Mother: if He be purely God, He is not without a Father; but now He, remaining one and the same, is without a Mother as the Former, and without a Father as the formed.” Thence Proclus takes occasion to dwell on the debt which human nature owed, and of its utter inability to pay: a debt which could be paid by none but God, and which God accordingly condescended to pay. If CHRIST be one, and the Word another, we have no longer a Trinity, but a Quaternity. This were to rend the tunic of the dispensation, *woven from the top throughout*; this were to be a disciple of Arius, and with him to divide the Essence;—this were to sever the Unity, and to be ourselves severed from God. He came to save, but it was necessary also that He should suffer: and how could both these things be? A mere man could not save; a mere God could not suffer: but He That was God by essence, became man: and that which was, saved; and that which was made, suffered. “I see,” concludes the Saint, “His miracles, and I proclaim His Deity: I behold His sufferings, and I deny not His Humanity: Emmanuel opened the gates of nature as man; but burst not the bars of virginity as God. He so came forth from the womb of Mary, as by hearing He entered, [when she heard the Angelic Salutation]: so was He born, as He was conceived: without human passion He entered: without

human corruption He came forth;¹ as saith the Prophet Ezekiel: This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall pass out thereat: because the LORD, the God of Israel, hath passed out thereat, therefore shall it be shut. Behold the manifest setting forth of S. Mary, the Mother of GOD. Henceforth let contradiction be at an end: that, being enlightened with the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, we may obtain the Kingdom of Heaven for ever and ever."

As soon as the preacher had concluded, the loud and long-continued applause of the congregation gave token that his sentiments on the controverted question were entirely their own. Nestorius, with great presence of mind, relying on his power of extempore discourse, rose in his place, and commenced an address to the people. Though his name had not been mentioned, nor his office hinted at, by Proclus, the allusions to his three sermons were frequent and manifest; and the turn given to the text, *without Father, without Mother*, sufficiently showed the person whom Proclus had in view. It must be allowed that the answer of Nestorius, considering the circumstances under which he spoke,—the eloquent discourse that had preceded, the infuriated multitude that surrounded, and, above all, the badness of the cause that he supported, evinces a high degree of coolness, judgment, and tact. No wonder, he began, that these applauses are considered due to the praises of Mary: the Temple of the LORD's Flesh exceeds all praise. Still, the dignity of the Son of GOD ought not to be sacrificed to the honour of a creature. To say that GOD was born of Mary is to give a handle of unbelief to the Pagans: to say that GOD was joined to the Son of Mary is firm and impregnable ground. To affirm with him who had just spoken that CHRIST, Who was born of the Virgin, was neither purely GOD, nor purely man, was indeed a strange doctrine. Surely the people of Constantinople were not inferior in theological knowledge to those of Antioch: surely they would not endure to be told, as they had just been, that "GOD was made a High Priest." The words of the Angels to the Apostles as they stood gazing after their ascended LORD were beyond all

¹ We must thus translate, unless we would rather read, ἀφθάρτως ἐσῆλθεν, ἀπαθῶς ἐξῆλθε, *Without the corruption*

of human passion He entered: without the suffering of human birth He came forth.

controversy. *This same Jesus, Who was an hungered, Who died, Who bore the Cross, He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into Heaven.* If the Quickener of all could die, where is He That shall give life to us? To confuse the Persons of our LORD is to put arms into the hands of the Arians: the Catholic Truth is far otherwise to be enunciated. He who inhabited the Temple is one thing; the Temple which He inhabited, another. It is the LORD's own declaration. *Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it again.* By Nature, then, CHRIST is Two: in so far as He is the SON, One. To confound this with Photinianism was a mistake unworthy of a serious confutation: it was the only doctrine by which the error of Photinus could be opposed. *Answer not a fool according to his folly.* The blandishments of eloquence, the popularity of a dogma, must never be suffered to stand in the way of diligence in examination, and the glory of Truth.

Nestorius
answers
S. Proclus.

There can be no doubt that this sermon was not without its effect: and Nestorius resolved on re-stating at greater length, what he had then briefly touched. The three statements of Proclus, that S. Mary is entitled to the name of Mother of God,—that God was made a High Priest,—that God suffered and died,—afforded Nestorius materials for three elaborate sermons. They would appear to have been delivered on the Saturday and Sunday following Easter, and on the next Sunday.¹ In the first he endeavours to explain how the term “Mother of God,” may be used in an inoffensive sense, while he alleges that its employment may lead the way to heresy and blasphemy. “I have learnt,” he concludes, “from Scripture that God passed through the Virgin Mother of CHRIST; that God was born of her, I have never learnt. Holy Scripture never asserts this;—there we are told that CHRIST, that the SON, that the LORD, was born of

¹ All that is known for certain is, that they were delivered in the three *Synaxes* immediately succeeding Easter. Now these took place on Saturdays, Sundays, and the Festivals of the Principal Martyrs. But there were none of the latter at that season; the first two sermons were therefore probably pronounced at the earliest possible oppor-

tunity, as we have stated; but the third, which was very numerously attended by the friends of Nestorius, and looked forward to as his great effort, would therefore most probably be reserved for the Sunday. Still Garnier's words are very true: “vix definire licet, quo quisque die sermo sit dictus.”

the Virgin. Let us all confess this; for he that receives not the words of Scripture, when he has heard them, is wretched indeed. *Rise, take the Child and His Mother.* It is an Archangel that speaks. An Archangel¹ may be supposed to be acquainted with the Incarnation better than yourself. *And he arose, and took the Child and His Mother.* It saith not, he arose, and took God and His Mother.” And with this notably inapposite quotation, the sermon, as we now have it, abruptly ends.

The next sermon of Nestorius, founded on the text, “Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, CHRIST JESUS,” vehemently attacked the statement of Proclus, that God was made a High Priest. It contains little more attempt at argument than the stringing together of several passages which the author thought favourable to his views: and while, like the preceding, it suppresses the name of Proclus, it freely deals out to him the charges of madness, of heresy, of evident opposition to Scripture. Finally, the third and most famous sermon contradicted the dogma of the Birth and Death of God. It commences by a statement of the opprobrium, under which Nestorius then laboured,—and for which he seized this opportunity of congratulating himself. “Nothing,” says he, “is more wretched than the state of that shepherd who boasts that he has received the praises of wolves. For, if he desired to please them, and chose to be loved by them, woe to his flock! None can please at the same time sheep and wolves; and therefore do I condemn the voices of those that reproach me, and employ against them the words of our Lord, ‘Generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things?’” Such language shewed that no compromise was to be looked for: and the whole tenor of the discourse evinced the same thing. In its doctrine and its arguments it in no respect differed from those that had preceded it.

It was probably with a view of strengthening his cause by

¹ The passage stands, in the Greek text thus. Αὐτῇ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἡ φωνή, τάχα δὲ μᾶλλον σου. Τὰ κατὰ τὴν γέννησιν ᾗδεσαν οἱ ἀρχάγγελοι. Marius Mercator translates, Hæc angelorum vox est, imo tua. Fortasse generationem Ipsius noverat Archangelus. We would

read, from a comparison of the two, Αὐτῇ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἡ φωνή. Τάχα δὲ μᾶλλον, κ.τ.λ. The passage is only referred to, not quoted, in S. Cyril's Contradictions. (tom. ii. 10, C. Ed. Aubert, 1638).

spreading his dogma beyond his own Diocese, that Nestorius dispersed copies of his sermons, more especially of his first Homily, in all quarters. They by this means reached Egypt, and falling into the hands of some Monastic bodies were read and received. Cyril had hitherto taken no active part in the controversy that was raging at Constantinople. But he now came forward with a Letter to the monks, in which he stated and vindicated the True Doctrine of the Incarnation. We feel immediately that a new turn is given to the controversy. Cyril was an antagonist from whom Nestorius must instinctively have shrunk. There is no laboured panoply of culled texts and adjusted quotations: the Bishop of Alexandria seems imbued with the whole analogy of the Faith, and evidently perceives, almost by instinct, that it and the new doctrine could not co-exist. And yet it would also appear that Cyril was not as yet fully awake to the danger with which the Church was threatened. For he speaks, in one passage, of the desirableness of leaving a question so difficult in the obscurity with which it had pleased God to invest it. After bringing forward the authority of Athanasius, for the term which Nestorius had condemned, he proceeds to argue against those who, from the silence of Nicæa, object to the word *Theotocos*. After reciting the Creed, without its Constantinopolitan additions, he deduces from that the orthodoxy of the common belief as to the Incarnation. To call S. Mary the Mother of CHRIST, says he, is to bestow on her a term which, in a sense, might be applied to others: as it is written, Touch not My CHRISTs, and do My Prophets no harm. He then dwells on the objection, that S. Mary was in no sense the Mother of the Divine Nature of our LORD; and proves that in consequence of the intimate union between the Two Natures, which, however, he in no way confounds, (and we may see Divine Providence in his clearness, when we remember the heresy that was, at no great distance of time, to arise on this point,) what may be predicated of one may be, and in Holy Scripture frequently is, predicated of both. And from many passages both of the Old and New Testament¹

¹ The texts on which he principally dwells, are—Psaln xlv. 7; cviii. 1: Hebrews i. 6: S. Matt. xvii. 25: Isa. xxxv. 4; xl. 10: S. John x. 15: Hebrews iii. 1: Philipp. ii. 6, 7.

the writer makes manifest, that CHRIST was not a Deiferous Man, but Incarnate GOD. The concluding words of the Epistle were, in after times, perverted by the Monophysites to an heretical meaning: but they contain in themselves nothing besides Truth.¹ “Since then, according to nature, He is truly God and King, since we read expressly that they crucified the LORD of Glory, how can we doubt that the Holy Virgin is to be named the Mother of GOD? Thou, therefore, adore Emmanuel as truly One, nor, after the conjunction once made, again sever Him into Two. Then the infatuated Jew will laugh in vain, then will he be manifestly guilty of the Death of the LORD: then he will be convicted of having sinned, not against a man like ourselves, but against GOD the Saviour of all. Then shall the words be fulfilled,—Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters: ye have forsaken the LORD, ye have provoked the Holy One of Israel to anger: ye are gone away backwards. Then shall the Gentiles in nowise be able to mock at the Christian Faith. They will acknowledge that it is to no mere man that we pay Divine honour: GOD forbid: but to Him That in His Nature is GOD, for we are not ignorant of His Glory. For though He was born as we are, yet He remained that which He was, namely GOD.”

A copy of this Epistle was forwarded by Cyril to his apocrisarii, or ecclesiastical agents, at Constantinople²: and thus reached the hands of Nestorius. It was well received by several of the most influential men in the government, and some even thanked the Patriarch by letters for his exertions in the cause. But Nestorius, while for some reason he did not think fit to reply himself, committed that task to one Photius, who was probably a Priest attached to the great church. That pamphlet has perished: though Cyril himself saw it. Not contented with this, Nestorius is accused of suborning certain Egyptians, who were then resident in Constantinople, and had been banished from Alexandria by Cyril on account of their immoralities, to

¹ S. Cyril, Opp. v. iii. 17 B.

² It is unworthy of the open character of Cyril that, in speaking of this Epistle to Pope Celestine, he should say, *εἰτά τινες ἀπήγαγον ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει τὰ ἴσα*, as if it had been

accidentally carried to Constantinople, instead of being, as it was, industriously distributed there. And this may be the reason why Tillemont (Note xiv.) denies the correctness of the account of Garnier.

present a memorial both to himself and to the Emperor against their Patriarch, accusing him to the one of ill administration of his Church, to the other, of arrogating to himself Imperial powers in the civil government of his province.

In the mean time, as the controversy was beginning to attract the attention of the whole East, S. Celestine, who then filled the Roman chair, received information of it from some quarter, of which we are ignorant. A Council (as was so frequently the case), was then sitting at Rome: and the Pope, in its name, addressed a letter to Cyril, requesting information on the subject. The Patriarch replied; and then, understanding that Nestorius was still continuing his efforts to injure him at Court, addressed his first letter to him, which is extant. In this he complains that Nestorius left no means untried to injure him: that he had given no just ground for such proceedings: that he was impelled now to write, as well by his own desire to contend for the Faith, as by the Epistle he had received from Pope Celestine, and by the general complaint of the Eastern Churches; that if a false statement of doctrine had been made by Nestorius, the recognition of one word, the *Theotocos*, would restore orthodoxy to himself, and peace to the Church,—that he himself was not then for the first time engaged in the controversy, having composed a treatise on the Incarnation before the ordination of Nestorius; and that he was prepared to submit to imprisonment, exile, or death itself, rather than betray the truth once delivered to the Saints. This letter was despatched to Constantinople by Lampon, a Presbyter of Alexandria, and the confidant of Cyril.

S. Cyril's
First Letter
to Nestorius.
End of June.

Circ. August
1.

The terms in which it is couched were by no means calculated to conciliate: and show somewhat of the same spirit which had led Cyril to the vehemence displayed by him in his youth. Nestorius, to a mere worldly eye, has a great advantage in his answer, which is extremely short. "The importunity of Lampon," he writes, "has wrung from me these few lines. I shall say nothing further than this: that though, in the Epistle of your brotherliness, there are many expressions which ill assort with Christian charity, yet, for the sake of that gentleness than which nothing is more mighty, I am resolved to persevere in my former relations of friendship, and not to be provoked to a rupture."

It is evident that Nestorius was playing the same game which

Eusebius had employed with so much effect in the early part of the Pontificate of S. Athanasius, and was determined to represent the controversy as one about words, and its origin as lying solely in the pertinacious dogmatism of the Bishop of Alexandria. Henceforward, the two most powerful Sees of the East were in a state of open opposition, and in the ruin of his rival consisted the only safety of either Nestorius or Cyril.

The Patriarch of Constantinople resolved, if possible, to support himself by the authority of the Roman Pontiff. He therefore addressed to him an Epistle on the subject of certain Pelagian Bishops, then resident in Constantinople, and subjoined three pamphlets,—the first on the Incarnation: the second against the Arians and Macedonians: the third professedly against the Apollinarians, but in reality against the Catholic doctrine. Nestorius, however, was attacked at the same time by Marius Mercator, on the ground of the intimacy he maintained with the Pelagians; and by several monks of Constantinople, in which they complained of the hard usage to which they had been exposed, on account of their defence of the *Theotocos*, and demanded a Council. Complaints were openly heard of the conduct of Cyril, that, whereas he had shown himself manifestly equal to supporting the controversy, he had hitherto taken no steps in his official character to overthrow Nestorianism. He excuses himself, in a brief reply, by observing that himself, and all the Eastern Bishops, had, in fact, been anathematized by Nestorius, since all held Mary to be the Mother of God: and that to retort that anathema on those who should deny that title to her was a step which he and his Egyptian Synod had not thought it right, in the then juncture of affairs, to take.¹ But the eighteenth Paschal Homily, published at the commencement of this year, dwells, as might be expected, on the subject of the Incarnation, though it does not commence with that topic.² According to their usual custom the Synod of Alexandria assembled before Lent. S. Cyril, having now received the attacks made by Nestorius on Proclus, addressed a letter, in the name of his Council, to that Patriarch.

Nestorius
writes to
S. Celestine.

A.D. 430.
Jan. 6.

¹ S. Cyril, Opp. v. ii. 230 B.

vois rien de remarquable sur l'Incarnation.

² We cannot imagine how Tillemont can say (Note xiv.), *Dans la 18, je ne*

S. Cyril's
Second
Letter to
Nestorius:
February.

He commences by complaining of the injurious reports which had been circulated against him, and leaves his innocency to be vindicated by GOD: he proceeds to warn Nestorius of his errors, to prove that he misunderstood the Nicene Creed, to explain the Incarnation of the SON of GOD, neither by the conversion of the Divinity into Flesh, nor into man, that is into Flesh and Soul, but by the hypostatical union of the Soul and the Flesh to GOD the WORD: Who thus, in an inscrutable manner, became man, and is called the Son of Man. He proceeds to dwell on the two generations of CHRIST, from his FATHER, before all Worlds, from His Mother, in the world: he asserts that it was not by the infusion of the WORD into a man previously conceived by the Blessed Virgin, that CHRIST became what He was; he explains in what manner GOD may be said to have suffered, in what manner to have died, and to have risen again: in what manner the Humanity of CHRIST is to be adored: he affirms that the term *Theotocos* has the authority of the Fathers, and concludes as he began, with entreating Nestorius to acknowledge his error.¹

March.

Nestorius replied by an Epistle which evinces more talent than any of his other writings.² He artfully confounds his use of the word GOD, with that of the word Divinity; and thus, by confusing the abstract with the concrete, is enabled to distort various passages of Scripture to his own meaning. He however, virtually at least, allows that Two Natures are united in one Person³: and praises Cyril for asserting this "true," as he calls it, "and orthodox" dogma.⁴ The end of this letter is remarkable. Nestorius praises the zeal of Cyril for preventing scandal, but tells him that he has been misled by the clergy of Constantinople, who entertained his sentiments, but were infected with Manichæan errors: that so far from the Byzantine Church being in any confusion or trouble, its state had never

¹ S. Cyril, Ep. iv. tom. v. ii. 22. This Epistle was said at Chalcedon to have been written in the month Mechir: that is, between January 26 and February 24, and probably, as Tillemont observes, before Lent, as having been approved by the Septuagesimal Council.

² S. Cyril, Ep. v. tom. v. ii. 25.

³ See the very learned note of Garnier, Mar. Merc. ii. 62. But it is clear that he means a moral, not a real union.

⁴ Ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὴν τῶν φύσεων ἐπὶ ἑνὸς διαίρεσιν, κατὰ τὸν τῆς Ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ Θεότητος λόγον, καὶ τὴν τούτων εἰς ἐνὸς προσώπου συνάφειαν, κ. τ. λ. v. ii. 27 A.

been more flourishing,—that, in particular, the Court was well satisfied with all that had passed, and concludes with an application to himself and his opponent of the text, “David waxed stronger and stronger, and the house of Saul waxed weaker and weaker.”¹

In mentioning these “Manichæan” clerks, who were undoubtedly Catholics, as opposed to Pelagians, Nestorius adds that they had been deposed, and the Council in which this deposition, whether just or unjust, took place, was probably held at Constantinople according to the usual custom, enjoined by the Canons of Nicæa, before the Lent of this year.

By the same messenger to whose care he had entrusted his second Epistle to Nestorius, Cyril had also written to his apocrisiarii, instructing them how to reply to the difficulties proposed by the Nestorians,—how to bring forward their own arguments,—and, above all, on what conditions to assent to a pacification.² He had also addressed a letter to a common friend of Nestorius and himself (who has been supposed to be Acacius of Melitene) protesting that he was earnestly desirous of peace, so that it could be obtained only without injury to the Faith³; but that he was resolved to suffer the extremest penalty before he would suffer that to be violated or attacked.

In the mean time the See of Rome had not been idle. When Celestine had received from Nestorius the letters that we have already mentioned, he lost no time in laying them before Leo, then Archdeacon of Rome, afterwards his more celebrated successor. By his advice the documents were entrusted to his intimate friend Cassian, to be translated into Latin and refuted. And a more suitable choice could hardly have been made. For, besides his skill in both languages, he had a particular affection for the Church of Constantinople, in which he had been ordained deacon by S. John Chrysostom. The result was the work of Cassian on the Incarnation, divided into seven books, and containing a complete refutation of Nestorius, whom the writer frequently quotes, but never names.

Having probably heard some report that such a work was in hand, Nestorius again addressed Celestine: in appearance on the subject of the Pelagians, but in reality with the intention

¹ 2 Samuel, iii. 1.

² Ep. viii.

³ Ep. vii.

Cassian's
Treatise on
the Incarna-
tion.

of making good his own cause. This letter was entrusted to Valerius, a patrician of reputation, and an active friend of the Patriarch's; but the result, as will be seen, by no means answered the expectations of the writer.

S. Cyril, finding that the account given by Nestorius of the favourable disposition of the Emperor towards his doctrine was not unfounded on fact, addressed two treatises to Theodosius, and his sister Pulcheria, who is since reckoned among the Saints. That Princess appears not to have shared in the general prepossession towards the Patriarch of Constantinople; and doubtless her dislike to his tenets was strengthened by the timely interference of Cyril. He, meanwhile, as soon as the Paschal Festivities were over, despatched an Alexandrian Deacon, by name Possidonius, to Rome: together with a confession of faith, authorized by the Septuagesimal Synod, and contained in a letter to Celestine.¹ Possidonius was detained some weeks in Rome, probably while Cassian was putting the finishing stroke to his work: at length, in the beginning of August, a Synod met in that city, where the Treatise on the Incarnation, Cyril's confession of faith, and the Epistle of Nestorius, were publicly read. The Synod resolved that the statements of Nestorius were heretical, that those of Cyril were consonant to the orthodox faith; that the Patriarch of Constantinople should be compelled, on pain of deposition, to subscribe the Alexandrian confession, on or before the tenth day after monition,—and that Cyril should take the proper means for notifying and carrying out the sentence. The Pope, in the name of the Council, wrote to Cyril, informing him of the province that had been assigned to him; to Nestorius, warning him even now to recant his error, and escape the severest penalty that the Church could pronounce: to the Clergy of Constantinople, exhorting them to stand fast in the faith: and to the Prelates of four of the principal Oriental Sees, John of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Rufus of Thessalonica, and Flavian of Philippi, setting forth what had already been done, and the peril with which the Truth was menaced. These letters all bear the same date, August 11, 430.

Council of
Rome:
Nestorius
condemned:
August.

¹ It is curious to observe the malicious ingenuity with which Gibbon twists this fact. "The vanity of Celestine was flattered by the appeal, and the partial version of a monk decided the faith of the Pope," &c. viii. 287.

Possidonius returned with these documents to Alexandria, and having allowed himself a few days' rest in that place, proceeded to Jerusalem and Antioch. To the Prelates of those Sees Cyril also wrote, defending his own proceedings, and acquainting them with his appointment as the Legate of Celestine, to carry out the resolutions of the Roman Council. The result was a letter from John of Antioch to Nestorius, advising him, but in vain, to retract. As soon as the unwearied Deacon had embarked, Cyril assembled the autumnal Synod, and, as its head, addressed his last and most celebrated letter to Nestorius, which was approved as it seems most probable on the third of November. None can justly accuse Cyril of eagerness in procuring the downfall of his opponents, but such as, to carry out their own preconceived hypothesis, dare to violate all truth, and to reject all testimony. The controversy had now lasted two years: the unity of the Church was endangered. Rome commissioned (had commission been needed) and the East requested Cyril to interfere: the rationalizing Oriental school was gathering strength, and every moment's delay was dangerous; and yet, allowing a month for the voyage of the Deacon from Rome to Alexandria, the Patriarch delayed his final and decisive communication to Nestorius six weeks longer. The letter, which is of considerable length, contains the Creed of Nicæa, and an exposition of that part of it which concerns the Incarnation,—which exposition Nestorius was summoned to sign, as also to subscribe to twelve anathemas, proposed by Cyril, and directed against the errors of the new Constantinopolitan school. These celebrated anathemas are in substance as follows:—

S. Cyril's
Third Letter
to Nestorius:
November 3.

1. If any shall assert that EMMANUEL is not Very God, and consequently that His Blessed Mother is not the Mother of God:
2. Or, that the WORD is not hypostatically united to the Flesh, so as to be one CHRIST:
3. Or, that the Union is not real, and more than a simple connexion of authority and power; thus, after that union, dividing the LORD into Two Hypostases:
4. Or, that the things said of CHRIST in the Gospels, Epistles, or by Himself, are attributable to Two Persons or Hypostases:

5. Or, that the SAVIOUR was not True God, but a Man carrying or filled with the Divinity; whereas the WORD being Incarnate was fellow-sharer with us in Flesh and Blood:
6. Or, that the Word is the GOD or LORD of CHRIST, instead of confessing that after the Incarnation of the Word, One and the same is God and Man:
7. Or, that the Man JESUS was energized by the operation of GOD the WORD:
8. Or, that the Man, assumed as an Habitation by GOD the WORD, ought to be honoured, and glorified, and named GOD *with* Him, as being another from Him:
9. Or, that CHRIST was enabled by the SPIRIT, as by a virtue alien from Himself, to do His mighty Works:
10. Or, that our High Priest was not the Very WORD of God; or, that in the Sacrifice offered for man, He offered also for Himself:
11. Or, that the SAVIOUR'S Flesh is not life-giving, as proper to the WORD, but as belonging to another joined with the WORD:
12. Or, that the WORD did not suffer, was not crucified, and did not rise according to the Flesh:

LET HIM BE ANATHEMA.¹

This Epistle was dispatched to Nestorius by four Egyptian Bishops,² Theopemptus of Cabasa, Daniel of Dardanis, and

¹ The precise authority which the anathemas hold as an exposition of the teaching of the Church is expounded with even more than his usual ability by Tillemont, Art. xl. It appears that the Council of Ephesus approved the writings of S. Cyril to Nestorius in general terms,—while the anathemas themselves were permitted to pass without comment in the mass, but not especially noticed;—that the feeling of many of the Fathers was very strong against them;—that S. Gennadius wrote most strongly against them, and S. Proclus disapproved of them;—that in the lifetime of Cyril they found no defenders but himself, Marius Mercator,

and perhaps Acacius of Melitene: that the Council of Chalcedon purposely omitted all mention of them; that as late as the end of the fifth century they were held in doubtful reputation; that however the fifth and sixth Councils expressly approved them; that they were alleged by Pope S. Martin in the Council of Lateran against the Monothelites as authoritative;—and that since that time they have generally been considered as part of the teaching of the Church.

² Baronius, 430, L. makes Potamon and Macarius to have been priests only. This mistake is corrected by Garnier, Præf. xix., and Pagi, 430. xi.

Potamon and Macarius,¹ whose sees are unknown. With it, Cyril despatched two others. The one is addressed to the Clergy and people of Constantinople; in which, as upbraiding himself for the delay which had taken place, he informs them that the step was now taken which ought to have been made long before; that the authority of Celestine and of himself had denounced excommunication to the troubler of the faithful; and exhorts them, whatever might happen, to stand firm, remembering the blessing promised to them that are persecuted for righteousness' sake. The other is to the monks of the Imperial City, in which the Alexandrian Synod praise them for, and exhort them to maintain, their constancy.

The Bishops sailed from Alexandria at the beginning of November, but contrary winds prevailing, they did not arrive at Constantinople till Friday, the fifth of December. Thus they crossed, as we shall see, the mandate of the Emperor for the Œcumenical Synod. On the following Sunday, at the conclusion of the Liturgy, they followed Nestorius to the Bishop's palace, and there, in the presence of almost all his Clergy, and a considerable number of laymen of rank and station, they delivered to him the anathemas.² After receiving them, he promised the Legates an audience on the following day; but, on

Nestorius
admonished:
Dec. 7.

¹ We know not whether this be the same Macarius on whom the heresiarch Dioscorus composed a panegyric: Asseman. Bibliothec. Orient. i. 619.

² There is a hot dispute as to the day on which the monition was delivered to Nestorius. Pagi endeavours to prove at length that they were received by him on Sunday, Nov. 30: but we confess that his arguments 430, xiii., &c., do not appear to us capable of overthrowing those of Garnier. It is a point of no very great importance; but the plain words of Mercator, *Ejusdem sermo in Ecclesiæ habitus postquam literas Celestini Romani Episcopi, et Cyrilli Alexandrini denunciationes accepit viii. Id. Dec. post sextum diem, quam eadem literas accepit, must mean that he had received the letters on the*

6th, (7th,) and preached the sermon on the 13th of December: however Pagi, and Baluze (Nov. Coll. Conc. 422,) may try, by inserting a parenthesis before *postquam*, and after *accepit*, to elicit another sense. One thing however, is clear, that the date Nov. 30, Indict. xiii. attached to the Synodical Epistle of S. Cyril, is not genuine: both because Cyril always dates by the Egyptian, never by the Roman months: and because according to the method of computation in use till the eleventh century, the Indiction was xiv. not xiii: for till that period it always began in September. On this point also the History of Pelagianism by Cardinal Norisius (ii. 7.) may be consulted.

presenting themselves for that purpose, they were refused admittance. Nestorius, in the early part of the week, sent an express to John of Antioch, with a copy of the Epistle of S. Cyril. He appears to have mistrusted his own power of coping with such an antagonist, and he requested his friend and former Prelate to call on Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata for a reply.

Theodoret
supports
Nestorius :

Theodoret had now attained considerable eminence. Born at Antioch, he had been dedicated to God from the cradle ; he had been the intimate friend of Nestorius and John of Antioch ; and had now for about seven years been Bishop of Cyrus, in Syria, to which dignity he had been raised against his own will, as he preferred the quiet retreat of his monastery of Apamæa. He distinguished himself by his untiring zeal : his diocese had contained a great number of heretics, all of whom he was made the means of converting ; among others, he baptized ten thousand Marcionites. He wrote against both Pagans and heretics, and now, conceiving that the views of Cyril were Apollinarian, declared himself against them.

Nor is it to be wondered at, that one so intimately connected with the Syrian rationalistic school should have entertained apprehensions of the uncompromising tone of Cyril : or imagined that, to say the least, some balance of doctrine was needed in his statements. Andrew of Samosata, originally a monk of Constantinople, was of the same school and temperament as Theodoret ; like him also in this, that, while his feelings and prejudices were on the side of Nestorius and the Asiatic teachers, he did not finally forfeit the Communion of the Church.

Council of
Ephesus
convoked :
Nov. 19.

Before the Legates could arrive at Constantinople, the Emperor, by a rescript of the nineteenth of November, had, at the desire of both Catholics and Nestorians, convoked an Œcumenical Synod. Ephesus was fixed as the place : the approaching Pentecost as the time. The Bishops who were summoned by their metropolitans would thus be enabled to celebrate Easter with their flocks, before they began their journey to the place of meeting. It would appear that this “ appeal to the Future Council,” (as in later ages it would have been called,) had the effect of suspending the execution of the sentence on Nestorius. With the summons to the Council, the Imperial messenger bore a private letter from Theodosius to Cyril. The emperor accused

the Prelate of being the cause of the then troubles; and rebuked him for having addressed separate letters to himself and the Princess Pulcheria, as if there had been division in the Royal Family. To this letter Cyril thought it better to return no answer, till the Œcumenical Council should establish his innocence.

Having secured the co-operation of his Eastern friends, Nestorius, on the Saturday following his receipt of the anathemas, Dec. 13. delivered a sermon in the great church on the question. The Priest-Catechist had preached on the necessity and benefits of charity: and Nestorius, taking up the subject when he had left off, proceeded to complain, (though not expressly naming Cyril,) of the want of that virtue exhibited by the See of Alexandria in its dealings with Antioch and Constantinople. "From it," said the Patriarch, "Flavian and Nectarius suffered: from it, Meletius, now reckoned among the Saints: from it he, whose holiness, in spite of their unwillingness, thou hast been compelled to own, John Chrysostom." He then debates the question at great length, not without many inuendos against John of Antioch: and concludes by recommending moderation, on both sides, as to the use of words, so that Catholic virtues might be retained in deed. On the following day he again spoke, but very shortly, Dec. 14. on the same subject; and with that discourse, our collection of his sermons terminates.

As winter passed on, S. Cyril employed himself in the composition of three works: the first, his reply to Andrew of Samosata, whose work had been approved by a Council at Antioch; the second, his answer to the treatise which Theodoret, as requested, had composed: the third, his answer to the Blasphemies of Nestorius. The controversy raged uninterruptedly at Constantinople: Nestorius replied to the twelve anathemas of S. Cyril by twelve counter anathemas, and Marius Mercator again answered these.

With the approach of spring, preparations were made at Ephesus for the numerous body of expected Prelates: provisions were laid in, houses made ready: and the holy season of Lent drew on.

SECTION II.

THE ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OF EPHEBUS.

A.D. 431.
A.M. 157.

As soon as the Paschal Feasts were over, Nestorius and Cyril respectively set sail for Ephesus. The former was accompanied by ten of his Bishops, by a large body of private friends, among whom was Count Irenæus, and a sufficient number of slaves, who are said to have been armed: Count Candidian, the Emperor's commissioner and captain of the Imperial Guard, also went with the Patriarch. On the other hand, Cyril was attended by fifty of his Bishops: but was not accompanied by any retinue. As the Diocese of Alexandria contained about one hundred Prelates, we may judge that the Patriarch was unwilling to deprive the faithful of more than half their Pastors, lest the business of the Churches should be insufficiently carried on.

June 2 or 3.

Their voyage was prosperous as far as Rhodes: and thence Cyril wrote to his flock a short letter, expressive of his affection for them, and his desire to be remembered in their prayers. From Rhodes the Egyptian Prelates had a less favourable passage: nor did they arrive at Ephesus till the Tuesday or Wednesday before Pentecost, which this year fell on the seventh of June. Nestorius was already there: Juvenal of Jerusalem

June 12.

arrived on the Friday after Pentecost; and the concourse of Bishops was very numerous. Cyril embraced the opportunity of again writing to his people. The Prelates, he assured them, were in good health, and eagerly expecting the opening of the Council: nor did they doubt that the Catholic Faith would prevail, to the consolation of the orthodox, and the confusion of heresy. But "that wicked one, the sleepless beast, walked about plotting against the Glory of CHRIST¹": his purposes

¹ These words have been by most historians taken to apply to Nestorius, and perhaps they might not untruly have been said of him; nor is the character of Cyril such as to make his use of them, in itself, unlikely. Accordingly, *hæc plane de Nestorio*

Cyrillus, says Baronius: *de furoribus Nestorii*, writes Garnier, &c. Fleury says, more sensibly, *On veut qu'il entende Nestorius; mais c'est plutôt le démon, auteur de toutes les hérésies, quoiqu'il puisse avoir voulu marquer par cette énigme les cabales*

however must fail, since a Mightier than he confined him, and overruled them.

The fact that the Egyptian Bishops were well was of no trivial moment, for the extreme heat of the weather was most prejudicial to the health of the assembled Prelates, and had actually cost one or two their lives. The Fathers were extremely impatient of their long detention, and it began to be whispered that something more than the mere length of the journey must detain John of Antioch and the Oriental Prelates of his Diocese.

On the 18th of June, that Patriarch wrote to S. Cyril, acquainting him with the hardships which he had undergone in a forced march of thirty days. "Many of the Bishops," says he, "are sorely afflicted from the difficulties of the journey,—and many of our beasts of burden have perished through long continuance of labour. Pray therefore for me that we may accomplish without inconvenience the five or six days which yet remain, and embrace with joy thy holy and reverend head.¹" Alexander of Apamea and Alexander of Hierapolis were charged by the Patriarch to inform the Fathers of his near approach;—and they again and again requested them, on his part, not to delay the opening of the Council.

But during these delays, the Prelates were not idle. Various conferences were held on the grand subject of controversy; and S. Cyril found no more devoted adherent than Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus,—a Prelate whose personal character did not equal the orthodoxy of his sentiments. Among those who distinguished themselves by their eloquence in the sermons which were preached before the Fathers, S. Cyril stood conspicuous; though the vehemence of his expressions against Nestorius, who was, at all events, as yet uncondemned by the Church, can neither be justified nor excused.² Acacius of Melitene and Theodotus of

John of Antioch announces his near approach.

Occupations of the Fathers:

du parti contraire. But that he means primarily the devil is almost certain from his use of the well known *ὁ πονηρὸς*, as well as from a comparison of the *νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε, ὅτι ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος, ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος, περιπατεῖ*, of S. Peter, with the *περιέρχεται γὰρ ὁ πονηρὸς, τὸ ἀκούμιτον θηρὶον* of S. Cyril.

¹ Labbe iii. 445.

² C. 9.—*Οὗτος ὁ ἐπικατόρατος—ὁ βλασφημήσας τὸ λόγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ—μίασμα ὑπάρχων καὶ αἰσχρογενής—μανίαν εὐράμενος κακὴν, καὶ ἀθείαν περιβεβλημένος—* etc.

Ancyra also supported the True Doctrine, though friends of Nestorius. He, meanwhile, after having so far yielded as to confess that the Blessed Virgin might, in a certain sense, be termed the Mother of God, so she were also confessed the Mother of Man, relapsed into worse than his former error, and persisted in declaring that he would never allow a Child of two months old to be God.

they resolve
to open the
Council.

Wearied out with the delays of John of Antioch, suspecting that he was purposely prolonging his journey, finding that other Prelates had already arrived from a greater distance, and having already passed the prescribed time by fourteen days, S. Cyril and the greater part of the Prelates determined to open the Council on the twenty-second day of June¹; and, on the pre-

¹ We reserve for a note the much disputed question whether the Fathers of Ephesus, acting, most undoubtedly, at the instigation of Cyril, were justified in not waiting for the arrival of John of Antioch. Had they waited, the years of confusion which followed that Synod, nay, possibly the Great Schism itself, might have been avoided. Two excuses have been made for Cyril. The one, that the manifest delay of John proved that he wished to procrastinate the Council: the other, that the most clear-sighted of the Fathers were of opinion that much confusion would be avoided, and Truth more speedily triumph, by anticipating his arrival.

As to the first argument, John was unable to leave Antioch till the 18th of May. The distance is computed at thirty days. But this reckoning of course applies to strong and accustomed travellers. Even thus, the Prelates could not have reached Ephesus till June 17. If the age of the Bishops, their inaptitude for travel, the heat of the weather, and the number of their company, be taken into consideration, to say nothing of the time which the celebration of the Divine Offices demanded, (even supposing that the Prelates did not altogether

rest on the Sunday,) and the detention which John must have experienced in passing through his own Diocese,—we may conclude that he not only did not delay, but must have used great diligence to arrive when he did. It is true that Bishops more remotely situated than John, arrived at Ephesus before him; but then he was obliged to wait for some of his Prelates, whose Sees were situated twelve days' journey further than Antioch. The Patriarch in his apology to the Emperor requests him, by inquiry on the spot, to satisfy himself that his statement of the diligence he had employed was true. Evagrius, though utterly opposed to Nestorius, says, Ἰωάννης . . . ἀπελείφθη τῆς δρισθείσης ἡμέρας οὐτι ἐκων, ὡς πολλοῖς ἀπολογούμενος δοκεῖ (i. e., as is the opinion of many, on hearing his defence, if the reading be genuine). H. E. i. 3, and Valesius's note. If it be urged that John himself requested the Council not to suspend their operations on account of his absence, it may well be answered that he apparently contemplated merely the formal opening of the Synod, and perhaps the production of proofs and witnesses against Nestorius: not his final condemnation.

Again,—If John were really anxious

ceding morning, they signified, by four Bishops, their resolution to Nestorius. He, with seven Prelates who happened to be with him, replied, that he should come or not come, as he should judge expedient. He then went to Memnon, and demanded the church of S. John for himself and those of his party; the Council being in possession of that of S. Mary. Memnon, very properly, refused: and the inhabitants of Ephesus were loud in their approbation of his conduct. That day was employed by the Constantinopolitan faction in procuring signatures to a protest against the opening of the Council, previously to the appearance of John. It was signed by sixty-eight of the Fathers; but produced no impression on the majority of the Council.

Protest of
the friends
of Nestorius,

June 21,

The next day, the Imperial Commissioner, Candidian, hearing that Cyril and his partizans were already assembled in the church of S. Mary, hastened thither, and represented to them that his instructions forbade any secret or partial meeting of the Bishops, and expressly ordered that whatever was concluded on should be decided by common consent and in full Council. Cyril demanded to see the Commission, and after much hesitation on the part of the Courtier, it was produced. On being read, however, it was found to be totally irrelevant to the present question: merely ordering Candidian to be present, without a deliberative voice, at the Council, and to make arrangements for the decent order and uninterrupted quiet of the deliberation. The Fathers therefore declared themselves resolved to proceed: Candidian earnestly requested a delay of but four days; and

and
Candidian,
June 22.

for the acquittal of Nestorius, prudence would have suggested the necessity of concluding the whole matter before the arrival of the Roman Legates, who were known to be ill-disposed towards the heretic. As to the suggestion that he was desirous of seeing Nestorius irregularly deposed by Cyril, of then, for that very irregularity, deposing Cyril, and of thus himself presiding in an Œcumenical Council, it is too absurd to be for a moment entertained.

We must therefore rest satisfied with the second excuse, such as it is. Cyril knew that John was opposed to the twelve anathemas: in the approval of

those anathemas he conceived, and rightly conceived, the truth to be involved; he feared that the influence of the Orientals might procure their rejection; by anticipating their arrival he thought that he discovered an easy method of escape from the difficulty; and, through a momentary weakness of faith, instead of trusting the matter entirely into God's hands, he preferred to make use of a stratagem, which a more simple trust in Providence would have rejected. That the fault brought its own punishment in the confusions that ensued, is but too plain.

when this was denied him, he retired in anger, and despatched a protest the same day to Constantinople.

The Council
is opened :
Session I.

On the departure of the Commissioner, the Prelates took their places ; the book of the Gospels being open in the Episcopal Throne, to signify the Presence of CHRIST, and the Bishops being arranged on either side of the church. They were one hundred and fifty-eight in number, besides Bessula, a deacon of Carthage, who represented the African Church.

Cyril presided, both by virtue of his own dignity, and as Legate of Pope Celestin ; Juvenal of Jerusalem was next in honour ; then Memnon of Ephesus ; and after him Flavian of Philippi, who appeared for Rufus of Thessalonica. There were also six other Metropolitans.

When all were seated, Peter, an Alexandrian Priest, and chief notary, briefly stated the cause for which the Council was summoned ; and on Juvenal's demand, the imperial edict convening it was read. Memnon of Ephesus reminded the Prelates that sixteen days had elapsed since the period fixed for the first Session ; and Cyril pronounced it to be his opinion that the Council had now waited with sufficient patience for the Bishops not yet arrived. This being the general sentiment of the Fathers, Theodotus of Ancyra inquired why Nestorius was not present. The Bishops who had carried the citation on the preceding day gave an account of their proceedings, and mentioned the unsatisfactory reply which they had received. A second and third deputation, the first consisting of three Bishops, the second of four, were sent with a written citation to Nestorius : they found his house surrounded by soldiers, and could only obtain the reply, that when the Council was fully assembled, by the arrival of John of Antioch, he would appear before it. The defendant had thus been, as the Canons ordered, three times admonished ; Juvenal expressed his perfect willingness to do so a fourth time, but said that as they had no occasion to expect any happier result, the next thing, in his opinion, was to examine the question of faith. The Creed of Nicæa was first read, and then the second letter of S. Cyril to Nestorius. Cyril, when it was finished, said, " You have heard my letter : I believe it not to be at variance with the Faith of Nicæa ; if your opinions are different, say so." Juvenal of Jerusalem, the metropolitans, and a hundred and twenty

of the Bishops, severally declared their adherence to the doctrine of S. Cyril; and the rest of the Council expressed its concurrence by acclamation. The second letter of Nestorius was then read: when it was finished, Juvenal said, "This epistle is at variance with the Faith of Nicæa: anathema to them that hold its doctrine." The Metropolitans briefly agreed with him. Acacius of Melitene was the only one who spoke at length: he observed that the writer of that Epistle attributed the Birth and Passion of our LORD to His Humanity only, and therefore in effect destroyed the real Unity of GOD the SON with our flesh. When about thirty Bishops had expressed the same sentiments, the whole Council burst out in different cries, all tending to the same effect: "Anathema to the heretic Nestorius! Anathema to the doctrine of Nestorius! Anathema to him that will not anathematize Nestorius!" There was then a call for the letter of Celestin to Nestorius; a Greek translation of which was read; and it was followed by the third epistle of S. Cyril, that which contained the threat of excommunication if Nestorius did not retract within ten days, and the twelve anathemas. The Bishops who had been charged with the delivery of these letters proved that they had been given to Nestorius in the presence of all his clergy, after he had celebrated the Holy Eucharist on a Sunday in his Cathedral; but that so far from retracting his doctrine, he had, in his subsequent sermons, re-stated and enforced it.

Two of his intimate friends, Acacius and Theodotus, were examined as to whether any change had appeared in his sentiments since his arrival at Ephesus. They professed that, however dear Nestorius was to them, the Faith of CHRIST was dearer; and their testimony clearly showed, that he had not, in the smallest degree, retracted, on the contrary that, by his blasphemous expression concerning a GOD of two months old, he had amplified and strengthened his heresy. Extracts were next read by the notary on the subject of the Incarnation, from S. Peter of Alexandria, S. Athanasius, SS. Julius and Felix of Rome, Theophilus of Alexandria, S. Cyprian, S. Ambrose, S. Basil, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Gregory Nyssen, S. Amphilochius of Iconium, S. Atticus of Constantinople,—twelve Fathers in all, of whom one only, Theophilus, is not reckoned among the Saints.

Twenty articles, extracted from the writings of Nestorius, were also produced. A letter from Capreolus of Carthage, brought by his deacon Bessula, was then read : in it he excused his own and fellow Bishops' absence, on the grounds of shortness of notice, and the desolate state of Africa ; mentioned that S. Augustine who, on account of his reputation, had been specially summoned to the Council, had been called to his rest ; and prayed the Fathers to maintain the Catholic Faith against all novelties whatsoever.

Sentence was then pronounced against Nestorius to the following effect :—Forasmuch as Nestorius hath refused to obey our citation, and declined to receive the Bishops whom we charged with it, we have thought it necessary to examine his dogmas ; and having proved both by his letters and sermons, as well as his conversations in this city, that he holds and teaches heresy, we are compelled by the Canons and by the letter of our most holy Father and colleague, Celestin, Bishop of the Roman Church, to pronounce with tears this grievous sentence : Our LORD JESUS CHRIST, Whom he hath blasphemed, declares by this holy Council that he is deprived of all Episcopal dignity, and excommunicate from every Ecclesiastical Assembly.

This sentence was subscribed by Cyril, Juvenal, and all the Bishops then present ; others, to the number of forty, accidentally absent, or not yet arrived in Ephesus, afterwards attached their names to it.

Thus ended the First Session. It had opened at an early hour, and night had now shut in, although it was one of the longest days. On issuing from the Church, the Bishops found an immense multitude collected at the door to learn the sentence. It was received with expressions of great joy : the men conducted the Fathers by torchlight to their several lodgings, the women went before them with perfumes, and the city was generally illuminated.

On the following day the sentence was communicated to Nestorius, and affixed to the principal public places. At the same time the guardian and treasurer of the Church of Constantinople were informed of the deposition of their Bishop, and desired to take the same charge of the sacred property that they would do in case of a vacancy. S. Cyril also took the

opportunity of writing to those whom he knew to be the warmest and most influential supporters of the truth in the Imperial City.

Nestorius and Candidian, for their parts, drew up a memorial to the Emperor, complaining of the excesses and violences of the Council, accusing Memnon as the principal author of the disturbances, and requesting that the Synod, which they treated as not having yet commenced, might be held agreeably to the Canons: that none but Bishops should be admitted thereto; that but two Prelates should accompany each Metropolitan; and that the confusion attendant on a large and tumultuous assembly might thus be obviated. It is easy to see that the last requisition, however plausible in itself, was directed against Alexandria, that See, as we have observed, possessing no Metropolitan, except the Catholic of Abyssinia.¹

The Acts of the Council were some time in preparation for the Emperor's eye: and the opposite faction were thus enabled to present their own account first. The Acts had not only to be transcribed from the short-hand of the notaries, and furnished with the necessary apparatus of documents, (no inconsiderable task in itself, since the matter thus brought together exceeds in size the present volume,) but the whole was confessedly subjected to the revision of Cyril. He, no doubt, omitted such parts as were irrelevant to the matter in hand, such as the protest of Candidian: and, it is probable, such also as, in his judgment, made against himself. It is impossible but that something must have been said on the subject of the anathemas; and we have reason to believe that the feeling of many of the Bishops was strong against them. It is hardly likely that not one of the Prelates raised his voice in favour of Nestorius. We must remember, however, that such alterations, however much they may impair to us the value of the original documents, were certainly not regarded by contemporaries as necessarily unfair. No doubt it was necessary to subject the genuine Acts to a revision: much, in the heat of the moment, might be said, which the speakers would afterwards regret having spoken, and be ex-

¹ Fleury, (vi. 85,) by a pardonable *de metropolitains sous le Patriarche* inaccuracy, says, "car il y avait *peu* d'Alexandrie."

tremely sorry to have entered upon record ; there must necessarily have been much repetition, and much that would bear compression. The complaints, therefore, that have been raised against *any* alteration are evidently out of place : and on the question whether S. Cyril took any unfair advantage of the trust committed to him, we conceive that there are not data to decide.

June 27.

On the fifth day after the Council, John of Antioch arrived, accompanied by about fifteen of his Bishops. It appears that he had received information of what had been done from Count Irenæus, who had left Ephesus for that purpose. The Council, having heard that the Patriarch was entering the suburbs, deputed several Bishops and Priests as his escort into the city : but the soldiers by whom he was surrounded would not permit them to approach him. Immediately after arriving at his lodgings, without giving himself time to make any change in his garments, and covered with dust as he was, he held a Council of the Prelates whom he had brought with him, and of those of his faction who were already in Ephesus.

At this disorderly assembly, convened in a private room, summoned by no lawful authority, the fraction of a schism, without citation, examination, witness, or lawful judge, Cyril and Memnon were deposed. During all this time, the deputies of the genuine Council were in waiting at the door : they were then admitted, and allowed to give their message. They received, however, no other answer than blows, which were inflicted on them, in the very sight of John, by Irenæus and the soldiers. Escaping to the Synod, they exposed the marks of the ill treatment they had received, and in the presence of the Holy Gospels related what had passed. On this, the Fathers separated John from their Communion, till he should make reparation for the outrage at which he had connived. At this time the sentence against Cyril and Memnon was not known : for, though subscribed by forty-three Bishops, it was not published in the city, but privately sent to the Court as the Act of the True Council.

Session 11.
July 10.

In the mean time the legates Arcadius and Projectus, Bishops, and Philip, Priest, arrived from Rome ; and the Second Session of the Council was forthwith held. The proceedings were opened by the Priest, Philip, who demanded that the letter of Celestin to the Council, with which they were charged, should be read

and inserted in the Acts. Celestin, though by no means failing to support the dignity of the Chair of S. Peter, yet freely acknowledged in this Epistle, that there must be a concordance of the various Bishops of the Church for the preservation of the precious deposit of Divine Truth: he allowed that the charge of teaching was equally given to all Bishops; and exhorted them by their sound deliberations to maintain the reputation of that city where S. Paul had preached the Gospel, and S. John founded the Church. The Council loudly expressed its approbation, "Praise to Celestin, another Paul! to Cyril, another Paul! One Celestin, one Cyril, one Faith of the Council, one Faith over the whole earth!"

The Legates were then formally acquainted with the anterior proceedings: the Acts were laid at their disposal; and the Second Session thus terminated.

On the following day, the eleventh of July, the Fathers again assembled; the Legates declared their perfect accordance with the determination of the Council, and their approbation of the Canonical method of their procedures. The whole of the Acts of the First Session were then *pro formâ* read, and the Legate, Philip, after dwelling on the Primacy of S. Peter's Chair, then speaking by himself and his fellow Legates, announced his assent and consent to them; the two other Legates did the same, and at the request of S. Cyril, all three subscribed the sentence of the deposition of Nestorius. Synodal letters were written to the Emperor, and to the Clergy and People of Constantinople.

Session III.
July 11.

Five days afterwards, the Fourth Session was held. As the business was peculiarly connected with S. Cyril, Peter, the notary, as a member of the Church of Alexandria, abstained from conducting the proceedings, as before: but Hesychius, a Deacon of Jerusalem, informed the Council, that the most holy Bishops of Alexandria and Ephesus wished to present a memorial, which they held in their hand. Juvenal of Jerusalem desired that it might be read.

Session IV.
July 16.

It set forth the uncanonical proceedings of the Council held by John of Antioch; the deposition of Cyril and Memnon without citation, or opportunity of defending themselves; the bad character of the Bishops who had pronounced it, some of them

having even been deposed; and finally conjured the Council to oblige John of Antioch to appear before them in person, and there to give account of himself and of his proceedings. Acacius remarked, that the idea of any Council then assembled in Ephesus, except the Catholic Council at which he was assisting, was perfectly absurd, and that, for his own part, the request of Memnon and Cyril seemed superfluous; as, however, they thought otherwise, he proposed that John of Antioch should be forthwith summoned by three Bishops whom he named. The deputies went as they were desired; and on their return informed the Council that, when arrived at the lodging of John, they were refused admittance by soldiers who were posted at the door: that when their errand was known, they were insulted, ill-treated, and had, not without danger, escaped the swords of the military, and the stones of the populace. A second citation was made with as little effect; and the Council then declared, that as John had not appeared to defend his own proceedings, they were null and void.

Session V.

On the following day, S. Cyril complained that the schismatical party had published a paper derogatory to the Council, and accusing its members of Apollinarianism: he therefore desired that John should be a third time cited to answer for all these violences. The citation was again carried by three Bishops, who reported that on approaching the house of John, the clerks who surrounded it began, as usual, to insult them, but were restrained by the soldiers, who, it appears, were acquainted with the person of Commodus, one of the Legates, as having been posted in his Sec, Tripolis¹ of Lydia. That the Archdeacon of Nestorius, on hearing their errand, gave them a paper as from his own Council; and on their refusal to accept it, declined all further communication. On hearing this account, the Council pronounced John of Antioch, and his accomplices, to the number of thirty-five in all, excommunicate, and concluded the Fifth Session with subscribing the sentence, of which information was given as before to the court of Constantinople, as also to S. Celestin. It

¹ Situated near the Mæander, and now in ruins. Commodus was one of the Bishops who had signed the protest

against the opening of the Council till the arrival of the Orientals.

is remarkable that in the signatures Juvenal of Jerusalem, who seems to have presided on this and the former Session, subscribes before the Roman Legates.

The Sixth Session was taken up by matters of general importance : principally by the condemnation of an erroneous formula of Faith, to which some converted Asiatic heretics had been compelled to subscribe, and the proposition of an explanation of the Creed of Nicæa. It was decreed, in the Seventh and last Session, that the bounds of the jurisdictions of Metropolitans should remain as they were ; a complaint having been made by the Bishops of Cyprus that the See of Antioch had usurped, of late years, the authority of ordaining in that island. As John of Antioch was not present to defend the rights of his own see, the Council guardedly decreed, that if the assertions of the Cyprian Bishops were true, they should remain, as in time past, free. The fact was, that the claims of Antioch in this instance were well founded.

Thus the deliberations of the Council ended : but its troubles were yet to begin. The Count John arrived from Constantinople as the Emperor's Commissioner, and gave orders that the Bishops of both parties should appear on the following day at the house where he was lodged. The animosity between them was so great, that he considered it necessary to post a body of troops between the quarters of the two factions. On the next morning, Nestorius came first before the Commissioner ; shortly afterwards John of Antioch and his followers ; and lastly S. Cyril, with all the Catholic Bishops, except Memnon. The greater part of the day was spent in a series of useless disputes. The Catholics would do nothing while Nestorius, nor the schismatics while Cyril was present. The Count John at length, but not until evening, settled the matter, by obliging both of those Prelates to retire. To the rest of the Bishops he then read the Emperor's letter, which was so drawn up, as if both the false and the true Council were the same Assembly to which the acts of both were to be attributed, and was addressed to Pope Celestin, and to Rufus of Thessalonica, neither of whom were personally present. Its purport was that the deposition of Nestorius, of Cyril, and of Memnon, met with the approbation of the Emperor. The schismatics were overjoyed at this result ; the Catholics as

much depressed, and John, to avoid a popular tumult, arrested the three Bishops in question, committing them to proper guards. After this act, and attending prayers in the great church, the Commissioner gave a report of his proceedings in a letter to the Emperor; and with this went a strong remonstrance from Juvenal of Jerusalem, and the other Bishops who had assisted at the genuine Council: and who now exerted themselves in every way, both by fresh epistles to the Emperor, and by addressing the Bishops who then happened to be in Constantinople, to set their cause in its right point of view. So great was the prejudice excited against S. Cyril, that even S. Isidore of Pelusium, whose locality would naturally render him favourable to Alexandria, thought necessary to exhort him not to follow the bad example, and to be sharer in the violence, of his uncle Theophilus.

During the whole of these negotiations, S. Cyril was in considerable danger. He was strictly guarded by the soldiers appointed for that purpose, who even slept at the door of his chamber: nor could he be certain that any moment might not bring the Emperor's sentence for his banishment into some inhospitable region, where he could never more in this world hope for justice, nor for a return to the possession of his own See.

It is not our intention to pursue with minuteness the tedious course of negotiations which followed the Council of Ephesus. The Catholics of Constantinople manfully exerted themselves for their distressed brethren: and the Abbats and Monks were more particularly distinguished by the freedom with which they addressed Theodosius.

At length, in the month of August, the Emperor desired that a deputation from each of the Councils should wait on him. Both parties obeyed: and eight Commissioners were sent from each: on the Catholic side, Juvenal and Acacius, with the legate Philip, possessed the greatest influence; in the party of the schismatics, John of Antioch, and Theodoret. The instructions given to the former were carefully to avoid all communion with John of Antioch and his followers, at least until they had subscribed to the deposition of Nestorius, anathematized his doctrine, and asked pardon of the Council; they were also charged

with a letter of thanks to the Bishops at Constantinople, commending their zeal for the Council, and requesting them not to relax their efforts in its behalf. The instructions of the schismatics were far more general; the only point in which their deputies were restricted, was the forbidding them, on any pretext, to agree to the twelve anathemas of S. Cyril. This Father, in the meantime, employed himself in drawing up a defence of his anathemas, in which he shows that they are free from any taint of the heresies which were attributed to them, and exerts himself to reconcile the Oriental Prelates to himself and to his writings.

As soon as the Commissioners were on their journey, Nestorius was banished by the Emperor from Ephesus, with a permission, however, to go where he chose. This came to the knowledge of the deputies on their arrival at Chalcedon, for they were not permitted to cross the strait; and was a severe blow to the hopes of John of Antioch and of his party. On the fourth of September, both parties had an audience of Theodosius: in which, while nothing definite was settled, the schismatics obtained the grant of a church, while they should remain at Chalcedon. The deputies on both sides wrote to their respective Councils, and gave such accounts as might raise the hopes of their friends.

Theodoret preached more than once to the assembled deputies of his party, and was attended by a number of the inhabitants of Constantinople, whom the fame of his eloquence attracted across the strait. He expresses, in the fragments we possess, horror at the thought of a passible God; not distinguishing, or not choosing to distinguish, between this expression, and belief that the Divinity was passible. But he had the better grounds for his mistake, if, as is reported, Acacius of Melitene, one of the deputies, had advanced the latter proposition. He also speaks of Nestorius as the legitimate pastor of Constantinople, and expresses his firm belief that, at no distant period, he would be restored to that dignity.

At length, after five audiences, in which the Catholics confined themselves strictly to the facts of the case, and much to the chagrin of their opponents, would not dispute on points of doctrine, the Emperor announced his final determination in a letter

to the Council. While expressly forbearing to condemn the Orientals, he ordered the Bishops, including Memnon and Cyril, to return to their own Diocese, and exhorted them to cultivate peace to the utmost of their ability. At this result, confirming in fact the deposition of Nestorius, the schismatical deputies were frantic with disappointment. They despatched memorial after memorial to Theodosius; they conjured him to alter his judgment; they protested that they shook off the dust of their feet against him, and were clear from his blood. But their threats and lamentations were to no purpose; and their only remaining consolation was to vilify the character of Cyril in the last letter which they addressed to their friends at Ephesus. The Catholic deputies and Bishops at Constantinople proceeded to the election of another Bishop for that See, and consecrated Maximian, who had greatly distinguished himself by his efforts in behalf of the Council, to the dignity.¹ In the meantime S. Cyril returned in triumph to Alexandria, which he reached on the thirtieth of October, after an absence of rather more than half a year. It is said by his enemies that he did not wait for the Emperor's permission, but escaped from his guards before his final acquittal had been pronounced.

Oct. 30.

SECTION III.

RECONCILIATION OF ANTIOCH WITH ALEXANDRIA.

THE Sees of Antioch and Alexandria were now out of Communion, and John, during and on his return to the former, again deposed, in two separate Councils, S. Cyril, and the seven Bishops who had assisted in the consecration of Maximian. The latter, on the other hand, in a letter to the Archbishop of Alexandria, gave him the highest praise. "Thy desire,"—so he wrote,—"*O* Servant of GOD, is fulfilled: thy labours for the cause of the Faith accomplished: the wishes of thy piety brought to a close: thou hast been made a spectacle to Angels and to men, and to all the Priests of CHRIST. Thou hast not only believed in CHRIST, but hast borne for Him all kind of ills. Thou alone hast

¹ Socrat, H. E. vii. 35. And see Pagi, 431. xxxvii.

been accounted worthy to bear His marks on thy body. Thou hast merited to confess Him before men, that He might confess thee before the FATHER, in the Presence of the Angels. Thou hast been able to do all things in CHRIST, Which strengthened thee : thou hast overcome Satan through patience : thou hast despised torments : thou hast trampled on the fury of rulers : thou hast counted hunger to be nothing, because thou didst possess that Bread which, coming down from Heaven, imparteth Celestial Life to men¹." And S. Celestin, a few months later writing to the clergy and people of Constantinople, speaks as strongly : "In no work of an Apostle," says he, "was that apostolic man wanting : he conjured, he admonished, he rebuked." And comfort like this Cyril needed. The whole of the East was in the greatest confusion : and it was a happy circumstance that four out of the five great Sees remained firm to the True Faith. The Prelates, ordained in the place of Nestorian Bishops, were not everywhere favourably received ; in some places they had to call in the secular arm, in others they could not establish themselves at all. Theodosius consulted Maximian, and a few other Bishops, of whom some were, it would appear, the Deputies from the Council, as to the best means of restoring unity. They all agreed that John of Antioch must approve of the deposition, and anathematize the doctrine of Nestorius ; and that Cyril must forgive what had passed at Ephesus. There was a plan proposed, for the meeting of the two, in the Emperor's presence at Nicomedia ; but it was dropped, on account of the repugnance which John felt towards it. There was, however, a Council holden at Antioch, in which six propositions were drawn up, which S. Cyril was required to sign as a preliminary step to union. We know not what they were, further than may be gathered from Cyril's reply. "He could not," he said, "retract what he had written previously to the Council ; he was ready to declare the sufficiency of the Creed of Nicæa, only against those who explained it heretically its true meaning must be boldly stated ; that he was perfectly willing to forgive all the insults he had himself received, but that the See of Antioch must anathematize the heresy of Nestorius : he repudiated the doctrines of Arius and Apollinaris ; he held the

A.D. 432.

¹ Labbe, iii. 1061.

Divine Word to be Impassible; he acknowledged that the SAVIOUR'S Body was informed by a reasonable Soul, and he promised, when peace should be restored, to give full satisfaction on the subject of the twelve anathemas.

The reception of this letter was different among the Eastern Bishops, as their tempers or prejudices varied. But John of Antioch, the most important among all, thought that it afforded a ground for reconciliation. He despatched Paul of Emesa to Alexandria, with a Confession of Faith, and a letter, in which he stated his personal friendship for Cyril, his longing for peace, his ardent hope that the anathemas would be given up, and his joy that they had a common ground on which to argue, namely, the letter of S. Athanasius to Epictetus on the Incarnation.¹ This treatise was much insisted on by Paul, until Cyril by a reference to the original copy, preserved in the archives of Alexandria, proved that it had been altered by heretics. Indeed he was by no means satisfied with this communication, though confessing the orthodoxy of the Creed of John. Far from being an apology for the past, it was rather, he said, a new offence. Paul, who was well skilled in negotiations, used all his efforts to persuade him that this was not the case; he, however, could hardly prevail on the Bishop of Alexandria to admit himself to his communion, and only after signing a Confession of Faith, drawn up in the form of a letter to S. Cyril. Having done this, he preached in the great church of Alexandria on Christmas Day: and in the early part of his sermon, after dwelling on the peace to men which the Gloria in Excelsis promises, having pronounced the words, "Mary, the Mother of God, brings forth Emmanuel," he was interrupted by the acclamations of the people: "The True Faith! the same Faith! welcome, orthodox Bishop! welcome, like to like!" His discourse, which was very short, was continually interrupted by such exclamations as these: and on the succeeding feast of the Circumcision, he had the opportunity of explaining his sentiments at greater length. Paul was anxious that the declaration he had himself signed might be accepted for John of Antioch also: but to this S. Cyril would by no means consent, and drew up another formula which he required that Prelate as a condition of Communion to sub-

¹ Labbe, iii. 1128.

scribe, founded on John's own Confession. He at the same time carried on a negociation at Constantinople, for the purpose of bringing about the wished-for reconciliation; and the influence of the Princess Pulcheria was highly useful in the furtherance of his views. John, finding that his cause lost ground, was glad to come to terms: and signed the Confession of Faith which Cyril required, and which was the same which he had previously sent by Paul.¹ In it he expressed his belief, that "our LORD JESUS CHRIST is the Only Son of GOD: perfect GOD and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and of flesh subsisting: according to his Divinity, begotten of the FATHER before the world; according to His Humanity, born in these last days for our Salvation, of the Virgin Mary: consubstantial to the FATHER, according to His Godhead, and consubstantial to us, according to His Manhood: and in that the Two natures have been united, we acknowledge one LORD, one CHRIST, one SON. Wherefore we confess that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of GOD: because the Word of GOD was incarnate and made man." The formula concluded by an approbation of the deposition of Nestorius, and an acknowledgment of Maximian as the rightful possessor of the Throne of Constantinople.

The anxiety consequent on the prolongation of this affair, had already cost S. Cyril two severe illnesses: one before Christmas, at the time of the arrival of Paul,—the other a few weeks later, which prevented him from announcing in person the time of Easter, according to his custom. And that during the whole of this year he suffered from ill health, the commencement of his twenty-first Paschal Letter sufficiently shews.

S. Cyril announced the happy news of his reconciliation with John, in a sermon which he delivered on the twenty-third of April, in which he took occasion to explain his own tenets, and to vindicate them from certain objections which had been raised against them. For some members of the Latin Church took exception at this reconciliation, as if it had been brought about by a retractation, or at least suppression of the truth on the part of Cyril; and Isidore of Pelusium now as hastily accused him of a disposition to compromise the truth, as, during the Council

*Illness of
S. Cyril.*

A.D. 433

¹ Tillemont, xiv., 531, who is much more accurate in the statement of these tedious negotiations than Fleury.

of Ephesus, he had complained of his obstinacy in defending it.¹ On the other hand, some,—the precursors of the destructive heresy of the Jacobites,—complained that though he denied the existence of two Persons, he still allowed John of Antioch to confess two Natures in the SAVIOUR. The Orientals, when once satisfied that he was not implicated in the error of Apollinaris, were glad to profess their unity of faith with the Bishop of Alexandria: the Emperor and the Pope expressed their approbation of the happy reunion: and thus the difference, which at one time threatened such serious consequences, was quietly composed. Heresy, indeed, still prevailed in the far East, and Chaldæa was not many years afterwards separated—as it still remains—from the Church Catholic: the followers of Nestorius keeping up their succession of Bishops from that day to this. Theodoret was one of the last to forsake the heretical party: and though some of his expressions on the Incarnation were always held unsound, or at least suspected, he thenceforward lived, as he finally died, in the Communion of the Church.

With respect to the conduct of the Oriental Bishops throughout this whole affair, we may remark that it has been usually characterized in much harsher terms than truth allows. One or two of the companions of John fell away into open heresy;—but the greater part, as soon as Cyril gave proof that he was not an Apollinarian, thankfully accepted his Communion. Had it not been for these men, the Monophysites, in the next phase of that controversy, by which the Church was harassed for two hundred and fifty years, would have reaped a fearful advantage: when, in fact, they did use or abuse, even notwithstanding this safeguard, many of the expressions of the Alexandrian Patriarch.

S. Cyril was much taken up in the business of composing, both by writings and by negotiation, the divisions of the East; but he also found time for the arrangement of a Paschal Cycle of ninety-five years. That Alexandria was still considered, by the larger majority of Christians, the Second Church, we have a striking proof in a letter of Pope Sixtus to a Council of Illyria, wherein he draws a distinction between the Decrees of the Council of Constantinople on matters of Faith, and on points of Discipline.

A. D. 437.

¹ Baron. 433. iv.

After this time we find Cyril vainly attempting to procure the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia: and from time to time interposing in the Oriental disputes on the Incarnation. In the course of his labours in this way, he once visited Jerusalem. At length, worn out rather with labour than years, he departed to his reward on the twenty-seventh day of June, A.D. 444.

June 27,
A.D. 444.
Death

The character of S. Cyril, like that of S. Gregory VII., S. Thomas of Canterbury, Nikon, and our own Laud, is precisely that which the world will never be able to comprehend. That he should have laboured and suffered, and spoken and written so earnestly in defence of an abstract point of doctrine, should have excommunicated, and should have been excommunicated for its sake; and, in obtaining the victory should have been content, although a heresy, yet existing, thereby had birth,—all this is mystery and scorn to those who have not learnt to value Catholic doctrine on the subject of the Incarnation, as closely connected with the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist, and with our own Resurrection, or who have learnt to despise dogmatic teaching under the lax influence of a faithless age. But Cyril, while he knew the value of the great deposit which he guarded, was willing to yield every thing of a personal nature to his adversaries, and insisted on nothing which he did not deem essential to the preservation of the truth in its fulness and purity. It is true, that in youth his temper had been hasty, and his manner perhaps overbearing: so much the more is it to his praise, that in the great act of his life, the Council of Ephesus, where the one was severely tried, and the other closely observed, the defects of his earlier years are in vain sought. Again: his calm and moderate statement of Truth is worthy of notice. Pressed by adversaries who asserted the doctrine of Two Persons in our Lord, it would have been most natural for him to fall, as his followers did, into the opposite error of denying the existence of Two Natures. This he never did. The same writings, which had crushed one heresy in the Council of Ephesus, crushed its opposite in that of Chalcedon: they have indeed been quoted by the Jacobites, as testimonies in their favour, but only in detached portions, and with a manifest perversion of their sense. If, in any of his voluminous works, he speaks in a manner

and
character of
S. Cyril.

which may seem to give advantage to the Monophysite creed, it must be remembered that many of his writings were falsified when the Church of Alexandria, with all its archives, was in the power of that sect. The letter of S. Leo, which was with respect to Monophysitism what the anathemas of S. Cyril were with respect to Nestorianism, was approved by the Fathers of Chalcedon expressly on the ground of being consonant with them. And Theodoret, with a candour which does him the highest honour, makes use of the works of his great rival as a sword against the Apollinarians, with whom he once confounded him, and against the Monophysites, who professed, and still profess, to be his followers. If, nevertheless, any casual expression may fairly be quoted as favouring the tenets of Eutyches, we must say with the Catholics in their great conference with the Severians, that if such expression seems at variance with the Twelve Anathemas, and S. Cyril's defence and explanation of them, we neither approve nor condemn it. If we compare S. Cyril's conduct with that of others, who have been placed in a similar position, it will but shine the more brightly. It is no derogation from the veneration due to the memory of a most glorious Doctor of ~~the~~ Church, to say, that S. Augustine, in defending the doctrine of Divine Grace against the Pelagians, sometimes trembled on the verge of heresy: and, as matter of fact, the worst errors of Calvinism are defended by quotations, (unfair, it is true, and distorted quotations) from the writings of that Father. Again, S. Jerome, in his writings against Vigilantius and his fellows, while elevating Virginité, gave great countenance to those who regarded marriage as a tolerable evil, rather than as being honourable in all. And, as we have seen, S. Dionysius, in opposing Sabellianism, gave great occasion to the Arians to blaspheme. And yet S. Cyril's temptations to defend one truth at the expense of another, were stronger than in any of the above cases. There may be other Fathers whose writings will be more generally interesting, and in these days more profitable, (though at the present time, when many openly refuse, in unconscious heresy, to bestow on the Blessed Virgin the title of Mother of God, they seem peculiarly appropriate,) but we shall not be wrong, while bestowing the first place among the defenders of Divine Truth

on S. Athanasius, in allotting the second to S. Cyril. His courage was, doubtless, his most distinguishing feature: but his moderation in his conduct with John of Antioch, and his acquiescence in the creed proposed by the latter, notwithstanding the comparative unsatisfactoriness of some of its expressions, are truly praiseworthy. And if at Ephesus he may be thought to have carried matters with a high hand, it must be remembered that his moderation was chiefly visible in his prosperity, his impetuosity in his adversity. And even in that action which may be considered the great weakness of his life, his precipitation of the Council of Ephesus, he still evinced the same disregard of personal danger in the prosecution of a great cause. His humility is amply proved by the patience with which he received the unjust rebukes of S. Isidore of Pelusium. Thus, with S. Eulogius, we shall call him "the ardent, the pious, the learned, the never-vacillating"; with Anastasius, "the most celebrated and blessed light of the Fathers"; with the Menology, "the glory of all Priests, the defender of the most Holy Synod"; with Sabbas of Palta, we shall regard him as one that, by the inspiration of the HOLY GHOST, followed the doctrine and expressions of the Fathers; with S. Celestine, as the generous defender of the Faith, as he that made good all that S. Paul requires in a teacher; even though we may not entirely subscribe the affectionate exaggeration of S. Sixtus III., that "Cyril surpassed all persons in all things.¹"

It remains to say a few words on the fate of Nestorius. After having resided for some time at his monastery of S. Euprepus, near Antioch, he was banished by the Emperor to Petra. But Theodosius appears to have changed his determination, and the great Oasis was chosen as the final place of his exile. The end of his life was miserable. Driven by the barbarians from the Oasis, seeking, in extreme old age, a refuge in Panopolis, hurried thence, by the inhumanity of the governor to Elephantine, recalled before arriving there, brought back to

End of
Nestorius.

¹ Of the internal government of his Church, S. Cyril has left few memorials. He was accused by his enemies of Simoniacal consecrations, apparently without the shadow of reason. He is

said to have been the first to institute Festival Stations at Alexandria: and Makrizi reports that he was also the first to erect images in the churches of Egypt.

Panopolis, half dead with fatigue, and suffering from the effects of a fall, and again exiled to a neighbouring town, he was seized with a mortal disease; and according to some his tongue, according to others his whole body, being eaten of worms, he gave up the ghost. By his followers he is, of course, esteemed a glorious Saint and Confessor: the Jacobites have a tradition that the dews of heaven visit not the grave of the heresiarch.¹

SECTION IV.

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF EUTYCHIANISM.

THE bright days of Alexandria are past: and we are about to trace the decline of a Church, which we have followed through her various stages of increasing splendour, till, in S. Athanasius and S. Cyril, she reached the zenith of her reputation. It was reserved for a disciple of the latter to commence the downward course.

Dioscorus,
Pat. XXV.
A.D. 444.
A.M. 160.

On the death of S. Cyril, his Archdeacon Dioscorus succeeded to the chair of S. Mark, although, as it would appear, not without some opposition. For it was afterwards asserted² that he had been ordained by two Bishops only: and this report, though probably exaggerated, seems to indicate a diversity of sentiment from the outset as to the merits of the Bishop-elect.

He had hitherto been accounted a man of excellent disposition, and was much beloved for his humility.³ But the asperity with which he claimed from the heirs of S. Cyril certain money which he alleged to be due to the See, procured him many enemies; nor was it accepted as a satisfaction by the people, that

¹ We learn from Gregory Barhebræus, (*Asseman Bibl. Orient.* ii. 316,) that in later times, Gabriel, a celebrated Nestorian physician, in Syria, who had heard from a friend of the insults to which the tomb of Nestorius was exposed, obtained an order from the Caliph, requesting the Sultan of Egypt to send the bones of that Prelate to Bagdad. But this was pre-

vented by the officiousness of a Nestorian monk, who affirmed that in a vision it had been revealed to him that the Jacobites were wasting their fury on a cenotaph, and that the resting place of Nestorius was unknown to mortal man.

² *Epist. Ep. Prov. Pont.*

³ *Theod. Ep. 60. Baron. 444. xix.*

these sums were employed by the Patriarch in enabling the sellers of bread and wine to furnish the poor with subsistence at a lower rate.

In the answer which Pope S. Leo wrote to the letter, in which, according to custom, Dioscorus announced his election and consecration, we find the first attempt on the part of the Church of Rome, to intermeddle with the affairs of that of Alexandria. He gave the new Bishop instructions as to the rites to be observed at Ordinations and in Festivals, prefacing his advice with the apologetic, and indeed half-playful, remark, that doubtless the observances of the two Churches were the same, inasmuch as S. Peter must have taught S. Mark the same discipline which he himself observed. And in point of fact, there was, as we have already had occasion to notice, a great similarity between the ceremonies of the two Churches. One remarkable point of discipline whercin they agreed, is pointed out in this letter of Leo: that even on the greatest Feasts, such as Easter, the Holy Eucharist was only celebrated in one church of the city, although it might be repeated as often as there was occasion, from the multitude of the people who attended in several distinct congregations.

S. Leo writes to him :

The new Bishop, however, soon shewed that personal holiness formed no part of his character. His palace was disgraced by the public dancers of Alexandria, and the too celebrated Irene was notoriously entertained as the Patriarch's concubine.²

his immorality,

Theodoret had been, previously to the death of S. Cyril, apparently much esteemed by Dioscorus, as indeed the tone of the letter addressed by the former to the latter on his elevation sufficiently proves. But after that event, the Archbishop of Alexandria thought fit to change his conduct to his early friend. He, in the meanwhile, continued his writings on the subject of the Incarnation, and particularly opposed himself to the teaching of those who, through an excessive zeal against the errors of Nestorius, maintained that there existed only One Nature in the SAVIOUR. Whatever, in other passages, may

¹ S. Leo. Ep. xi. Ed. Cacciari.

² Gibbon quotes, with a malicious pleasure, an epigram of some unknown Alexandrian, not deficient in wit :

“Εἰρήνη πάντεσσιν” ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν
ἐπελθών·

Πῶς δύναται πᾶσιν τὴν μόνος ἐῖδον
ἔχει;

A.D. 447.

have been the soundness of his expressions, he was here, at least, maintaining the Catholic doctrine; and among other witnesses in its favour, he cited Theophilus and Cyril, who could neither of them be suspected of any partiality for the heresy of Nestorius. Theodoret was accused of dividing the Person of our SAVIOUR into two Sons, and Dioscorus, probably wishing to imitate Cyril, wrote to Domnus of Antioch, in which city Theodoret had promulgated his opinions. The latter addressed a letter to his accuser in his defence, in which, after satisfactorily explaining his faith, he concluded by anathematizing those who should say that the Blessed Virgin was not the Mother of God. But Dioscorus paid no manner of attention to this defence; he not only, in the Church of Alexandria, delivered Theodoret over to an anathema, but made a formal complaint of him to Flavian of Constantinople. Theodoret loudly complained of this step, as in contravention of the Canons of Nicæa. "The province of Alexandria," so he wrote to Flavian, "is Egypt and Egypt alone; if that city has the chair of S. Mark, Antioch has that of S. Peter, the Master of S. Mark." Domnus, for his part, also sent a deputation to Constantinople, to defend himself against the charges of Dioscorus; regardless of the taunts of the latter, that Antioch was thus giving precedence and jurisdiction to Constantinople, and abandoning its high post of the Church third in dignity.

and
violence.

A.D. 448.

Council of
Constanti-
nople:
Eutyches
condemned.

It was evident, that although Alexandria and Antioch professed the same faith, there was a substantial difference in their tenets; and an occasion soon presented itself of bringing them into collision. There was one Eutyches, Abbat of a large monastery near Constantinople, who had been a friend of S. Cyril, and was considered by him as one of the staunchest defenders of the Truth against Nestorius. This man was accused by Eusebius of Dorylæum, (who by a singular coincidence had been the first opponent of Nestorius,) of renewing the Apollinarian heresy, by asserting that the Divinity and Humanity of the Son of God formed but One Nature, and that the former as well as the latter had suffered. This heresy had often been imputed to S. Cyril, but was now clearly brought home to Eutyches, before a Council of about thirty Bishops at Constantinople. They treated him with the utmost patience; but finding him invincibly

wedded to his errors, proceeded, Flavian being the president, to anathematize himself and his tenets. This proceeding threw the East into confusion: Flavian was stigmatized as a Nestorian in disguise: even Pope S. Leo, afterwards the great bulwark of the Church against the Eutychians, was not at first fully satisfied¹: and the Emperor was finally persuaded to summon an Œcumenical Council at Ephesus. Several letters were addressed by Theodosius on the subject: one to the future Council, marking out the question to be debated, namely the differences which had arisen between Flavian and Eutyches; one to the two commissioners, whom he appointed for the maintenance of order; and one to Dioscorus, appointing him President, Flavian being required to appear as a party, not as a judge. Leo was also invited to attend: but excused himself on account of the shortness of notice. He however sent three legates: Julius,² Bishop of Puteoli; Renatus, a Presbyter; and Hilarus, Archdeacon of the Roman Church, and addressed a most important letter to Flavian, on the subject of the Incarnation; which, from its subsequent reception by the Church, may be considered an embodiment of Catholic teaching on this point.

Convocation
of an Œcu-
menical
Council at
Ephesus.
A.D. 449.

As it was the rejection or adoption of this Epistle which influenced the whole future fortunes of the Church of Alexandria; as a great part of its subsequent history is nothing else than an account of the struggle between the heresy condemned, and the truth supported by Leo; and as without a clear understanding of the exact and dogmatical decision of the Church on this subject, much that will occur in the following pages will be unintelligible, it seems well to give a translation, in this place, of the doctrinal portion of this celebrated Epistle.³

LEO BISHOP, TO HIS BELOVED BROTHER FLAVIAN, BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

HAVING perused the letters of your love, at the lateness of
which we marvel, and having gone through the Episcopal Acts

Tome of S.
Leo.

¹ S. Leo, Ep. xx. (ii. 23)....nondum agnoscimus, quâ justitiâ à communione Ecclesiæ fuerit separatus, &c.

² Cacciari, ii. 89, note M.

³ The reader will bear in mind that we are translating from the Edition of

Cacciari, (tom. ii. 114—138,) who makes it the twenty-fifth Epistle. It is necessary to premise this, because several of the readings in the various editions differ considerably.

in order, we have at length become acquainted with the scandal which has fallen out, and which has risen among you against the integrity of the Faith, and those matters which aforehand appeared to be hidden, have at length been opened and made manifest to us. By which it appears to us, that Eutyches, who was beforetime honourable from the name of Priest, is exceedingly imprudent and unlearned; so that the saying of the Prophet may refer also to him,¹ *He hath left off to be wise, and to do good, he imagineth mischief upon his bed.* For what more wicked, than to give the mind to impiety, and to refuse trust to the wiser and more learned? but into this folly they fall, who, when they be by any obstacle hindered from the knowledge of the Truth, seek not to the voice of the Prophets, nor to the letters of the Apostles, nor to the authority of the Evangelists, but to themselves: and are therefore masters of error, because they were not disciples of Truth. For what erudition hath he acquired from the sacred pages of the New and Old Testament, who understandeth not even the principles of the Creed itself. That which is uttered through the whole world by the mouths of all Catechumens, is not yet received in the heart of this aged man.

He then, ignorant what he ought to believe concerning the Incarnation of the WORD of GOD, and unwilling to labour in the extent of Holy Scripture, that he might merit the light of intelligence, must at least have received by continual hearing that common and consentient confession, by which the whole multitude of the faithful professes, That they believe in GOD the FATHER ALMIGHTY, and in JESUS CHRIST His Only SON our LORD, Who was born by the HOLY GHOST of the Virgin Mary. By which three sentences the engines of well-nigh all heretics are destroyed. For since GOD, Almighty and Eternal, is asserted to be the FATHER, it is proved that the SON is Co-Eternal with Him, differing in nothing from the FATHER, because He is GOD of GOD, Almighty of Almighty, Co-Eternal Son of the Eternal; not later in time, not inferior in Power, not dissimilar in Glory, not divided in Essence; and the Same Eternal and Only Begotten SON of the Eternal FATHER was born of the HOLY GHOST, and the Virgin Mary. Which temporal Nativity in no way detracted from that divine and eternal Nativity, in no way added to it; but expended

¹ Psalm xxxvi. 3, 4.

itself wholly¹ in restoring man, who had been deceived, and in conquering death, and destroying by its virtue the Devil, who had the power of death. For we could not have overcome the author of Sin and Death, unless He, Whom neither sin could contaminate, nor death detain, had taken upon Himself our Nature, and made it His. For He was conceived of the HOLY GHOST in the womb of the Virgin Mary, who bare Him, even as she had conceived Him, without loss of Virginity.

But if from this most pure Fount of the Christian Faith he was not able to draw true knowledge, because he had, by his own blindness, darkened the splendour of manifest truth, he should have betaken himself to the doctrine of the Evangelists, seeing that Matthew saith, *The Book of the generation of JESUS CHRIST, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham.* He should have sought instruction from the preaching of the Apostle; and, after reading in the Epistle to the Romans, *Paul, a Servant of JESUS CHRIST, called to be an Apostle, separated unto the Gospel of GOD, which He had promised afore by His Prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning His SON JESUS CHRIST our LORD, Which was made of the Seed of David according to the flesh,* he should have turned his pious attention to the pages of the Prophets, and he would have found the Promise of GOD to Abraham, *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.* And that he might not doubt concerning the propriety of this Seed, he should have followed the Apostle, where he saith, *Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of One, And to thy Seed, Which is CHRIST.*² He should have apprehended by the hearing of his heart the preaching of the Prophet Isaiah, *Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His Name IMMANUEL, which being interpreted is GOD with us.*³ He should have read with faith the words of the same Prophet, *For unto us a Child is born; unto us a Son is given; and the Government shall be upon His Shoulder; and His Name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty GOD, the Everlasting Father, the Prince*

¹ It seems much better, with Quesnel and the Ballerini, and the Greek, to read *totam se*, than, with Cacciari, *totum Se*.

² Gal. iii. 16.

³ Isaiah vii. 14.

of *Peace*.¹ Nor did he speak in vain, when he said that the WORD was made Flesh, as if CHRIST, born of the Virgin's womb, had the form of a man, and not the verity of His Mother's Body. Or did he think that our LORD JESUS CHRIST was not of our nature, because the Angel, sent to the Blessed and Ever-Virgin Mary, saith, *The HOLY GHOST shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also That Holy Thing Which shall be born of thee shall be called the SON of GOD*²: as if, since the conception of the Virgin was a Divine Act, the Flesh of the Conceived was not of the nature of the conceiver? But we are not to understand that Generation, singularly admirable, and admirably singular, in such sort, as if, by the novelty of That Which was created the propriety of kind were removed.

For the HOLY GHOST gave fecundity to the Virgin: but the Verity of the Body was taken from her body; and Wisdom building Herself an House, *The WORD was made Flesh and dwelt among us*³: namely, in That Flesh which It took from man, and animated with the spirit⁴ of rational life. The propriety then of Each Nature and Substance being preserved, and both uniting so as to form One Person, humility was assumed by Majesty, infirmity by Virtue, mortality by Eternity, and to pay the debt of our condition, inviolable was united to passible nature: that (which was in congruity with our remedy) One and the Same Mediator of GOD and Man, the Man CHRIST JESUS, might be able to die from the one, might not be able to die from the other. Therefore in the whole and perfect Nature of Very Man, Very GOD was born, altogether GOD, altogether as we. But in saying "as we," we mean in those things which the CREATOR formed in us at first, and which He undertook to restore. For what the Deceiver introduced, and deceived man committed, of these things there was no trace in the SAVIOUR. Nor did He, because He participated in human infirmities, therefore participate in human guilt. He assumed the form of a servant, without spot of sin, honouring humanity, not dishonouring Divinity; because that emptying of Himself, by which, being Invisible, He made Himself Visible, and being CREATOR and LORD of all

¹ Isaiah ix. 6.

² S. Luke i. 35.

³ S. John i. 14.

⁴ We read, with the Greek and Quesnel, *spiritū*.

things, condescended to be a Mortal, was the inclination of His Compassion, not the failure of His Power. For He, Who remaining in the Form of God made man, The Same, in the form of a slave, was made man. Each Nature holds without defect its own propriety; and as the Form of God destroys not the form of a servant, so the form of a servant diminishes not the Form of God. For because the Devil boasted, that man, deceived by his arts, was without divine gifts, and deprived of his dowry of immortality endured the hard sentence of death, and in his miseries he had found some consolation from the fellowship of another transgressor (viz. man), and that God, the principle of justice so requiring, had changed His Own designs touching man, whom He had formed in so great honour; need was there of the dispensation of a secret council, that God, Who cannot change, and Whose Will cannot be deprived of its benignity, should fulfil towards us, by a hidden Sacrament, the Dispensation of His Mercy, and that man, driven into sin by the craft of the malice of the Devil, might not perish, contrary to the Will of God.

The SON of GOD therefore enters this lower world, descending from the Heavenly Seat, yet not departing from the Glory of His FATHER, begotten after a new sort, by a new Nativity. After a new sort: because, invisible among His Own, He condescended to become Visible among us: the Incomprehensible condescended to be comprehended: He That existed before time, to be born in time; the LORD of the Universe took upon Himself the form of a servant, having veiled the immensity of His Majesty: the Impassible God disdained not to be a passible man: the Immortal to be subject to the laws of death. By a new Nativity: because inviolate Virginity was ignorant of concupiscence, and yet ministered the material of Flesh. From the Mother of the LORD, nature, not sin, was assumed; and in our LORD JESUS CHRIST, born of the Virgin's womb, because His Nativity was wonderful, it followeth not therefore that His Nature is dissimilar from ours. For He That is Very God, the Same is also Very Man; and there is no deceit in this Union, while the humility of man and the Majesty of God meet together. For as God is not changed by the Mercy displayed, so man is not consumed by the dignity bestowed. For each form

acts after its proper sort while in communion with the other : the WORD working that which is proper to the WORD, and the Flesh accomplishing that which is proper to the Flesh. The one is glorious with miracles, the other yields to injuries : and as the WORD recedeth not from the equality of the FATHER'S Glory, so the Flesh leaveth not the nature of our race. For,—which is often to be repeated,—He is One and the Same : Very SON of GOD, Very SON of Man. GOD :—because it is written, *In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with GOD, and the WORD was GOD*¹ : Man : for *the WORD was made Flesh, and dwelt among us*.² GOD : for *all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made*.³ Man : for *He was made of a Woman, made under the Law*.⁴ The Nativity of the Flesh is a proof of Human Nature : the pregnancy of a Virgin, testimony of Divine Virtue. The Infancy of the Babe is shown by the humility of the cradle ; the Majesty of the MOST HIGH is declared by the songs of Angels. He was in form as the infants whom Herod sought to slay ; but He is the LORD of all, Whom the Wise Men rejoice, as suppliants, to adore. When He came to the Baptism of John His Forerunner, lest it should be hidden from sight that Divinity was concealed by the veil of the Flesh, the Voice of the FATHER thundered from Heaven, and said, *This is My Beloved SON in Whom I am well pleased*.⁵ To Him, Whom as man the craft of the Devil tempteth, to the Same as GOD, the services of Angels minister. To be an-hungered, a-thirst, to be weary, to sleep, is evidently human. But to feed five thousand with five loaves, and to give to the Samaritan Woman Living Water, which whoso drank should never thirst, to walk the sea with unsinking footsteps, and to still the lifting up of the waves by rebuking the tempest : this, without doubt, is Divine. As therefore,—to pass over many things,—it is not of the same Nature to weep for Lazarus, a departed friend, and by the command of the Voice to raise him from the dead, having rolled away the stone of the four days' sepulchre ; or to hang on the tree, and to turn day into night, and shake the elements ; or to be pierced with nails, and to open

¹ S. John i. 1.⁴ Gal. iv. 4.² S. John i. 14.³ S. John i. 2.⁵ S. Matt. iii. 17.

the gates of Paradise to the faith of the thief:—so it is not of the same Nature to say, *I and the FATHER are One*,¹ and *the FATHER is greater than I*.² For, albeit in our LORD JESUS CHRIST there is One Person of GOD and Man, yet *that* whence con-tumely is common to both, and that whence glory is common to both, differs. From our Nature He hath the Humanity, which is less than the FATHER; from the FATHER He hath the Divinity, which is equal with the FATHER.

On account then of this unity of Person to be understood of both Natures, we read that the Son of Man descended from Heaven, since the SON of GOD took Flesh of that Virgin of whom He was born. And again, we read that the SON of GOD was crucified and buried, though He suffered these things, not in His Divinity, in which He is Only-Begotten and Co-Eternal SON, and Consubstantial with the FATHER, but in the Infirmary of His Human Nature. Wherefore we all, even in the Creed, confess that the Only-Begotten SON of GOD was crucified and buried, according to that saying of the Apostle, *For had they known it they would not have crucified the LORD of Glory*.³ And when our LORD and SAVIOUR Himself was instructing by His questions the faith of His Disciples, *Whom*, said He, *do men say that I the Son of Man am?* And when they had related the divers opinions of divers persons, *But ye*, saith He, *Whom say ye that I am?* Whom say ye that I, Who am the Son of Man, and Whom ye see in the form of a servant, and in the verity of Flesh, Whom say ye that I am? Then blessed Peter divinely inspired, and about, by his confession, to profit all nations, *Thou art*, saith he, *the CHRIST, the SON of the Living God*.⁴ And not without reason was he pronounced blessed by the LORD; and he, who by revelation of the FATHER confessed the same to be the SON of GOD, and CHRIST, drew from the Corner Stone the firmness both of his virtue and of His Name: because one of these things confessed without the other, had not profited to salvation; and it was equally dangerous to acknowledge the LORD JESUS CHRIST to be GOD alone, and not Man, or Man alone and not GOD. But after the Resurrection of the LORD, which was the Resurrection of a true

¹ S. John x. 30² S. John xiv. 25.³ 2 Cor. ii. 8.⁴ S. Matt. xvi. 16.

Body, because the Same arose from the dead, Who had been crucified and buried, what else was performed by the delay of forty days, than that the integrity of our Faith should be purged from all darkness? For conversing, and dwelling, and eating with His Disciples, and allowing Himself to be examined by the diligent and curious touch of those, who yet doubted; He therefore both entered, when the doors were closed, and by breathing on them bestowed on them the HOLY GHOST, and gave them the light of understanding, and opened to them the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures, and also showed them the Wound in His Side, and the prints of the nails, and all the signs of His recent Passion, saying, *Behold My Hands and My Feet, that it is I Myself; handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have*¹: that the proprieties of the Divine and Human Natures might be acknowledged to remain in Him undivided; and that we may thus know, that the WORD is not that which the Flesh is, but might confess that the One SON of GOD consisteth of the WORD and the Flesh.

Of which Mystery of Faith this Eutyches is to be reputed altogether ignorant, who has neither acknowledged our nature in the SON of GOD, neither by the humility of mortality, nor by the Glory of Resurrection; nor feared the saying of the blessed Apostle and Evangelist S. John, where he saith, *Every spirit that confesseth that JESUS CHRIST is come in the Flesh is of GOD: and every spirit that divideth*² *JESUS is not of GOD: and this is Anti-Christ*. But what is it to divide JESUS, except to separate from Him the Human Nature, and by impudent fictions to make void the Mystery of Faith, by which alone we are saved? For he that is ignorant with respect to the Nature of the Body of CHRIST must also be possessed with the folly of the same ignorance with respect to His Passion. For, if he believes that the Cross of the LORD was not imaginary, and that the Sufferings undertaken for the Salvation of the world were real, let him acknowledge His Flesh, Whose Death he believes. Let him not deny that He was a Man with a Body like our own, Whom he allows to have been passible; for

¹ S. Luke xxiv. 39.

² 1 S. John iv. 4. "Divideth," *solvit*, or as others read, *scindit*. The

Greek Version has τὸ διαιροῦν. The present Greek text reads, ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

a denial of His Flesh is a denial of His Corporeal Passion. If therefore he embraces the Christian Faith, and turns not away his ears from the preaching of the Gospel, let him see what Nature it was that hung transfixed with nails on the wood of the Cross; let him understand, when the Side of the Crucified was opened by the spear of the soldier, whence the Blood and Water flowed forth, that the Church of God might be refreshed by the Laver, and by the Chalice. Let him hear also Blessed Peter the Apostle preaching, that Sanctification of the SPIRIT is through sprinkling of the Blood of JESUS CHRIST. Let him read attentively the words of the same Apostle, where he saith, *Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed by corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers: but with the Precious Blood of CHRIST, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot.* Let him not fight against the testimony of Blessed John the Apostle, where he saith, *And the Blood of JESUS CHRIST His Sox cleanseth us from all sin.* And again: *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our Faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that JESUS is the Sox of God? This is He That came by water and blood, even JESUS CHRIST, not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the SPIRIT That beareth witness, because the SPIRIT is Truth; for there are three that bear witness, the SPIRIT, and the Water, and the Blood, and these three are one.* The SPIRIT, that is, of Sanctification, and the Blood of Redemption, and the Water of Baptism, which three are one, and remain undivided; and none of them is disjoined from its connexion because the Catholic Church lives and makes progress in this Faith, that neither in CHRIST JESUS must Humanity be believed without Very Divinity, nor Divinity without Very Humanity.¹

Dioscorus, on the receipt of the Emperor's letter, sailed from Alexandria to Ephesus, to take the presidency of the Council, just as S. Cyril, eighteen years before, had done. But here the resemblance ends: Cyril went to support Catholic Truth, Dioscorus to give for a while the victory to error.

¹ The concluding section is taken up with the proceedings of the Council of Constantinople, and does not treat immediately of the Incarnation.

SECTION V.

THE "ROBBERS' MEETING" AT EPHESUS.

THE time for the opening of the Council approaching, Dioscorus arrived at Ephesus with ten of his Bishops :—the mandate of the Emperor, requiring ten metropolitans, being, in his case, incapable of being obeyed. His cause, on first consideration, seemed fair. The friend of S. Cyril had been condemned in a hastily summoned Synod at Constantinople; and that friend an Abbat, venerable for his age, illustrious for his sanctity, distinguished for the opposition which he had offered to the first fury of Nestorianism. Many of those who clamoured against him had also calumniated S. Cyril: the charge of Apollinarianism was the same in both cases: the Prelate by whom he was condemned was openly accused by the Emperor as the origin of the troubles. One hundred and twenty-eight Bishops, besides the deputies of absent Prelates, with a large number of Priests and Abbats, assembled in the church of S. Mary: and Dioscorus presided, as well by virtue of his dignity, as by the express command of the Emperor. Next to him came Julian, Bishop of Putcoli, the Thrones of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople: the last-named See being thus unaccountably degraded to the fifth place.

Council
opened
August 8,
A.D. 449.

It was on the eighth of August, seven days after the appointed time, that the Council was opened. Though Dioscorus was President, yet the Emperor's letter charged Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Thalassius of Cæsarea, with a share in the conduct of affairs; though, in truth, their colleague allowed them little else than nominal authority.

John, a presbyter of Alexandria, and chief of the notaries, briefly stated the cause of the assembling of the Synod, and read the Epistle of the Emperor convoking it. Immediately on its conclusion, Julius the Roman Legate, interpreted by Florentius, Bishop of Sardis, informed the Council that Leo had also been summoned, and Hilarus, a Roman Deacon, the third of the Legates, (the Priest Renatus, who was one of them, having

died on the journey,) stated that it was not the custom for the Roman Pontiff to appear in person at an Œcumenical Synod; but they had an epistle addressed by him to the Council, which they were desirous to present to it. "Let the letters of our holy brother, Leo," said Dioscorus, evidently by a preconcerted plan, "be given in." As they were being handed forward, John the Notary, as if he had not heard the demand of the Legates, said that there were further letters of the Emperor, which it might be well to read. "Let them be read," said Juvenal of Jerusalem, "and inserted in the Acts." This communication requested that Barsumas, a Syrian Abbat, characterized as a man of great piety, (and who had come accompanied by a thousand monks,) should be present in the Synod, as the representative of all the Eastern Archimandrites. "The same notification has been made to me," remarked Juvenal; "and the Holy Œcumenical Council will probably do well to admit the Abbat." Dioscorus inquired if the Emperor's Commissioners, Elpidius and Eulogius, had any information to give on the subject? Elpidius spoke, and spoke well, on the grave responsibility of the Fathers. "To-day," said he, "the LORD and GOD of all, the WORD and SAVIOUR, submits Himself to your judgment, and honours you with the power of deciding His Cause; that, if He find you judging rightly here, He may both honour you on earth, and confess you before the FATHER when He shall come to judge the world. But if any come with a deceitful heart, to shake the foundations of the Faith, or to call in question the Doctrine of the Holy Fathers, woe to him from both, from GOD and from the Emperor! Good were it for that man that he had never been born; who, when the thief, and the publican, and the harlot, and the Syrophœnician confessed, refuses to acknowledge Him Who is in the Glory of the FATHER, and Who humbled Himself for our sakes." These reflections were evidently levelled at Flavian; and their object was made more manifest when the Imperial letters, having been read, were found openly to accuse that holy Prelate as the source of the present calamities. At its conclusion, Thalassius proposed that till the Faith was decided, nothing else, in compliance with the Cæsar's will, should be treated. "My instructions are the same," remarked Julius. Elpidius proposed the examination of the Acts

of the Constantinopolitan Council, and of the deposition of Eutyches. Dioscorus at once assented. "We must decide," said he, "whether they are consonant to the decrees of the Fathers. Ye would not wish to innovate on their Faith?" "Anathema," cried the Council, "to him that shall innovate! Anathema to him that shall call into question! Keep we the Faith of the Fathers!" And the notaries of Dioscorus added several exclamations in praise of that Prelate, which seem to have had no real existence, but which were inserted in the Acts. "Then," said Elpidius, "since the Council is unanimous in the confession of Faith, let the Archimandrite Eutyches be introduced, and heard in his own defence." There was a token of general approbation. Juvenal gave orders that the Archimandrite should be allowed to enter, and to produce his documents; and Thalassius, when he appeared, informed him that he was at liberty to bring forward anything which might serve his cause with the Great and Holy Synod.

Eutyches
heard in his
defence;

Eutyches, after uttering the words, "I commend myself to the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, and to your justice," handed in a memorial, which he requested the Council to consider, and which was accordingly read to them by John the Notary. It commenced with the Nicene Creed; after the profession of which, "This is the Faith," proceeded the aged Abbat, "in which I was born:—in which I was forthwith dedicated to GOD: in which I have lived:—and in which I hope to die." He then appealed to Cyril in defence of his position: accused, he said, by Eusebius of Dorylæum, of a heresy which could not be defined, because he objected to a new definition of the Faith, and clave to the Creeds of Nicæa and Ephesus, and to those alone. Vainly, he continued, had he appealed from the unjust judgment of Flavian to the future Council: vainly pointed to his hoary hairs, grown gray in warfare against heresy: unheard, unheeded, he was deposed by a sentence drawn up long before, anathematized, and delivered over to public indignation, as a heretic and a Manichæan. "To the judgment of your Blessednesses," concluded the Archimandrite, "I appealed from the beginning: and now again I confess, in the Presence of JESUS CHRIST, Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, that I thus hold, and believe, and understand, as the

Holy Fathers who assembled in Nicæa defined the Faith: which definition was confirmed by the former Council of Ephesus."

The memorial having been finished, Flavian spoke: "The accused has been heard: the accuser, Eusebius of Dorykæum, ought to be heard also." Elpidius interposed. The function of the present Council, he said, was not to re-open the question, but to judge at Ephesus those who had judged at Constantinople. The rest of the acts of that Council ought to be read. Elpidius, said Dioscorus, has spoken well. And he called on the other Bishops for their opinions. Juvenal of Jerusalem, Stephen of Ephesus, Cyrus of Aphrodisias, Thalassius of Cæsarea, and thirteen other Prelates, of whom the last, Uranius of Himeria in Osrhoene, spoke in Syriac, gave their sentence for reading the Acts:—and then the whole Synod, by acclamation, called for them. This unanimity of sentiment in so manifestly unjust a proceeding, might have been considered a fabrication of Dioscorus, had it not been allowed to pass unquestioned, when the Acts of the Robbers' Meeting were read at Chalcedon. Dioscorus, after the acclamation, turning to Julius, inquired whether he, as Vicar of the most holy Bishop Leo, also opined for the Acts? We will that they are read on this condition, replied Julius, that the Epistle of the Pope be first heard. "Since," said Hilarus, "the most holy Bishop of the Roman Church, on a perusal of the documents which ye now desire to hear, has written and sent"—Eutyches interrupted. The Roman Legates were suspected men:—they had lodged with Flavian:—he hoped that their testimony would not be received to his prejudice. Dioscorus insisted that the Acts should be first read, and then the Epistle of Leo: and the notary obeyed. The Acts were interrupted, as was usual, by various exclamations of the Council. The name of S. Cyril having been accidentally mentioned in the memorial presented by Eusebius to Flavian, there was a confused cry. "The memory of Cyril is eternal!" "Dioscorus and Cyril are of one mind!" "The Synod believes as Cyril!" "Anathema to him that adds!" "Anathema to him that subtracts!" "Anathema to him that innovates!" Julian said, "It is the Faith of the Apostolic See." The Acts of Constantinople included the Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius, part

the Acts at
Constanti-
nople read;

of the Acts of the First Council of Ephesus, and the Epistle of Cyril to John of Antioch, on the conclusion of the misunderstanding between their Churches. This was brought forward at Constantinople for the purpose of shewing that Cyril held, definitely and unreservedly, the doctrine of Two Natures Incarnate: and, as soon as it was finished, Eusebius, Bishop of Berytus, endeavoured to neutralize the effect which it might have produced on the Ephesine Synod. Cyril of blessed memory, he said, had been, by the wise ordering of Divine Providence, misinterpreted in his life, and so compelled to explain what might appear doubtful by what was more clear. Thus, though in the letter recited above, he appeared to allow Two Natures after the union, yet in other Epistles, to Valerian of Iconium, to Acacius of Melitene, to Successus of Diocæsarea, he had used these express words,—“We must not then imagine Two Natures, but One Incarnate Nature of God the Word.¹” And this statement has the authority, real or fictitious, of S. Athanasius. The reading of the Acts at Constantinople proceeded again, with hardly an interruption, till it came to a question put by Eusebius to Eutyches, in order to press him to declare that Two Natures remain after the Incarnation, and that CHRIST, according to the Flesh, is Consubstantial with us; then the Egyptian Bishops cried out, “Out with Eusebius! burn him! burn him alive! sever him in two! as he divided, let him be divided!” “Will you endure,” said Dioscorus, “that Two Natures should be spoken of after the Incarnation?” “Anathema,” cried his own Prelates, “to him that shall say so!” “I want your voices and your hands,” continued the President: “if any cannot speak, let him stretch out his hand.” And the obedient Egyptians again shouted anathema.² The remaining Acts of Con-

¹ This famous saying is believed to have come originally from Apollinaris, not from Athanasius. Doubtless it is not only patient of, but as the faith is now defined, positively involving an heretical sense. Nevertheless, it is possible that Cyril cited it, simply because he believed it to have come from Athanasius, and employed the word *φύσις* in the

sense of Person. But if he were ever betrayed into error by the pseudo-Athanasius, his testimony to the Doctrine of Two Natures is clear and distinct in other places; and the confession of Faith with which he was satisfied in the Orientals was, as we have seen, branded as Nestorian.

² It is necessary to read the Acts of

stantinople having been read, and the proceedings subsequent to the deposition of Eutyches, a conversation ensued as to whether the Acts of the Synod had been falsified. Flavian in vain endeavoured to obtain a hearing: and Dioscorus imperiously called on the Prelates to vote.

It is necessary to bear in mind the state of the Synod. Dioscorus, in the plenitude of his power, openly threatened deprivation and exile to those who should dissent from him: the Imperial troops blocked up every avenue to the church; the thousand monks of Barsumas were ready for any deed of violence; the Parabolani were ready to obey the least nod of their Master. That a sentence thus pronounced was not Canonical, is most certain: it is only marvellous how more than one hundred Prelates could so basely prefer their safety or their Sees to the Truth with which they were entrusted. Somewhat may be said in their favour. Eutyches came before them as the friend of S. Cyril; the archdeacon of S. Cyril presided in the assembly; the words of S. Cyril had just been quoted, "We confess One Nature after the Incarnation": the case had been prejudged by the Emperor; the Creed of Eutyches might be looked on as not so utterly opposed to that of his opponents; they affirmed that CHRIST was Consubstantial to us, according to the flesh, and he confessed that CHRIST was Incarnate of the Blessed Virgin, and that she was consubstantial to us: this, in a judgment of charity, might be supposed to neutralize the pertinacity of Eutyches in defending One Nature. Partly then terrified, partly ignorant, partly, perhaps, persuaded, the assembled Fathers set their hands to the acquittal of Eutyches, and thus the Monophysite heresy was born in the Church. Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, Stephen of Ephesus, and Thalassius of Cæsarea, led the way in this foul injustice; and, contrary to usual custom, all the Prelates gave their opinions separately,

Eutyches
acquitted.

the Latrocinium with the Commentary of the Fathers of Chalcedon, at their relection in that Synod, in order that we may not receive the assertions of Dioscorus for the words of the Council of Ephesus. The anathema to Eusebius is, in the Ephesine Acts, prefaced

with ἡ ἀγία σύνοδος εἶπεν, Ἐρον, καὶ σὺν κ.τ.λ. But when this was read at Chalcedon,—οἱ ἀνατολικοὶ, καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐυλαβέσταισι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν, Ταῦτα οὐδεὶς εἶπε· ταῦτα Διόσκορος εἶπε· ταῦτα οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι εἶπον.

there being no acclamation at the end. The Roman Legates would appear to have opposed the acquittal of Eutyches.¹

The Protonotary proceeded to inform the Council, that he held in his hands a memorial addressed to it by the Monks who composed the Religious House over which Eutyches had presided. It was found to contain, on being read, a complaint of the injustice suffered by them in common with Eutyches, and a prayer for redress. Their confession of faith was demanded, and declared orthodox, and they were accordingly absolved from all censure.

Dioscorus, having carried this point, determined on a still bolder step. The Acts of the sixth Session of the Council of

¹ The constancy or apostacy of the Roman Legates in the matter of the acquittal of Eutyches is a very important question. The evidence seems to stand thus in their favour:—1. S. Leo, in his Epistle to Pulcheria of Oct. 13, 449, says:—"Our Legates—of whom one, (*i. e.* Hilarus) escaping the violence of the Bishop of Alexandria, who grasped at every thing, has faithfully related to us the order of events, —protested in the Synod, as it was termed, against the judgment, it were more true to say the fury, of one man." Hilarus himself writes, apparently at the same date, to Pulcheria, "I could not participate in the will and decision of Dioscorus." 2. Hilarus was afterwards elevated to the chair of S. Peter: which could hardly have been the case had any shadow of imputation rested on his orthodoxy. 3. The Acts of the Latrocinium make no mention of the consent of the Papal Legates;—a very strong argument in their favour. 4. It is certain that Hilarus protested against the condemnation of Flavian. These considerations appear perfectly satisfactory as to the firmness of Hilarus.

The case is different with Julius and Dulcitus as to the condemnation of Flavian. 1. From the very fact that

the *Contradictur* of Hilarus is inserted in the Acts, it seems to follow, that, had the other Legates protested, their protest would also have been noticed. 2. Hilarus had to fly at once, for the sake of avoiding danger: it is hardly likely that his fellow Legates, had they followed his example, would have been suffered to remain peaceably. Few, we imagine, will agree with the argument of Baronius, *Si autem adeo gravia Hilarus Legatus passus est fugiens, quænam, putas, fuit conditio remanentium?* 3. There is a marked silence preserved by S. Leo, as to the conduct of his other Legates, while he loses no opportunity of praising the courage of Hilarus. If it be objected that he speaks of the constancy of his messengers, the use of the plural for the singular is too common to render it safe to found an argument on that peculiarity. It has been argued by some, and Baronius (449. c.) has fallen into the error, that Renatus, at least, stood firm, because a letter of Theodoret's is addressed to him, praising his courage at Ephesus. But, as Pagi (449 ix.) shows, Renatus died at Declos on his passage out: and the letter of Theodoret's must have been misdirected by some of the copyists.

Ephesus were, at his request, publicly read; and he then demanded, whether those, whose tenets were in opposition to those of that Synod, or of Nicæa, or who had added anything to, or subtracted anything from them, deserved condemnation or not? The Bishops declared that they deserved condemnation: the legates affirmed the same thing; still, though uselessly, pressing that the letter of Leo might be read to the Council. Dioscorus proceeded, that the Holy Councils of Nicæa and Ephesus had already laid down the Faith; that Flavian and Eusebius had been convicted of adding to the Creed of those Councils, to the subversion of all good order, and the scandal of the faith; and that therefore these two Prelates were deprived of all dignity both Episcopal and Sacerdotal. The whole Council was thrown into an uproar: Flavian exclaimed, "I appeal": and Hilarus, *Contradicitur*. Onesiphorus, Bishop of Iconium, with several others, threw himself at the feet of Dioscorus, beseeching him to proceed more slowly. "Flavian is deposed," replied Dioscorus: "were my tongue to be cut out for them, I would say no other words." And in the mean time, the Bishops went on signing the sentence. Onesiphorus, rendered desperate, urged his request in the strongest language: Dioscorus rising, cried, "Where are the Counts?" A body of armed men rushed in: swords waved, staves fell, and chains clanked, among the Bishops. Barsumas and his herd of followers fell on his opponents, insulting, wounding, and maiming them. The greater part were terrified into subscription: some stood firm till evening, and then yielded; a few, who were impracticable, were sent into exile. Flavian and Eusebius were thrown into prison: Hilarus escaped. Of all this violence, the Acts, as amended by Dioscorus, say not a word: they give the sentences of the various Prelates in the usual way:—and it is certain that through terror, or by persuasion, many signed, among whom were Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, and the thrones of Ephesus and Cæsarea. Of the conduct of the Legate Julius, we are not informed: if he did not acquiesce, it is certain that he offered no vigorous resistance. Three days afterwards, Dioscorus caused Domnus of Antioch to be excommunicated in the Council: and on his way home, excommunicated S. Leo himself: causing this latter sentence to be subscribed by the ten Egyptian Bishops whom he had

Dioscorus
proposes the
condemna-
tion of S.
Flavian:

he calls in
the military:

S. Flavian
condemned.

brought with him. From this time the power of the See of Alexandria declined, never to rise again.

S. Leo re-
jects the
Council.

When Leo was informed of the result of the Council of Ephesus, for which he waited with anxiety during a long time, as Hilarus was compelled to choose the most circuitous routes for his return, he assembled a Synod at Rome, wherein all its Acts were condemned. He wrote strongly on the conduct of Dioscorus to Theodosius, who paid no great attention to this communication, but requested Leo to communicate with Anatolius, the successor of the deposed Flavian. The latter was dead in banishment, having never recovered the violence of Barsumas: and he is reckoned by the Church among the Martyrs. On the propriety of acceding to the request of Theodosius, S. Leo suspended his judgment, but did not fail to instigate Valentinian, Emperor of the West, to demand the assembling an Œcumenical Council. Shortly after the receipt of this letter, Theodosius departed this life; his sister Pulcheria gave her hand to Marcian, who was forthwith raised to the imperial dignity.

A.D. 450.
Marcian,
Emperor.

The new Emperor was strictly orthodox: and from the very beginning of his reign determined to repair the faults of his predecessor. A Council was held at Constantinople, in which Anatolius anathematized Eutyches and his adherents, the Pope's Legates assisting: the body of S. Flavian was translated with all honour to his own church. Marcian wrote to S. Leo, proposing the convention of an Œcumenical Council: the Pope was not so well inclined to the project, on account of the then disturbed state of the West; but the resolution of the Emperor prevailed. An imperial edict assembled Bishops from all parts of the East, at Nicæa. Legates were despatched by Leo, who also wrote four letters on the subject, two to Marcian, one to Anatolius, and one to the Council. He recommends that no discussion should be allowed on points already ruled in the three Œcumenical Synods: that the Bishops deposed by the second Council, or as it was generally termed, the *Robbers' Meeting* of Ephesus, should be restored to their Sees: and that the greatest lenity should be shown to those who should renounce the Eutychian heresy, and express their sorrow for the past.

SECTION VI.

THE ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.

THE Fathers were assembled at Nicæa, when they received a letter from the Emperor, requesting them to suspend their deliberations till he could be present ; and on their soon after representing to him, that this detention from their flocks was extremely inconvenient to them, he requested them to come to Chalcedon, alleging that he could not on account of the threatened attacks of the Huns, absent himself for any time, or to any great distance, from Constantinople.

To Chalcedon, therefore, the Fathers resorted ; and found that the church of S. Euphemia, situated at a little distance from the city, and on the borders of the sea, was the place appointed for their meeting. Historians dwell with delight on the ravishing beauty of the prospect. The ground in front, well wooded in some parts, in others laid out in beautiful meadows, or rich with harvests, sloped down to the Propontis : beyond the strait, sometimes like a mirror of glass, sometimes rippling in the wind, rose, with its abbeys, its palaces, and its churches, conspicuous among which were those of the Holy Resurrection and of the Divine Wisdom, the Imperial city of Constantinople : behind was a stately amphitheatre of mountains, clothed with forest trees to the summit. The number of the assembled Fathers was far larger than in any other Œcumenical Council ; at Nicæa there had been three hundred and eighteen ; at Constantinople, a hundred and fifty ; at Ephesus, more than two hundred : but at Chalcedon there were six hundred and thirty. The magistrates, to the number of nineteen, were seated before the Altar rails ; on the left, the Catholic Bishops, in order thus : the legates of the Pope, the Thrones of Constantinople, Antioch, Cæsarea, and Ephesus : with the Bishops of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. On the opposite side were Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and the Bishops of Illyria, Palestine,

A.D. 451.
The Fathers
assemble at
Nicæa :

they repair
to Chalce-
don.

and Egypt. The Book of the Gospels, symbolising the Presence of the SAVIOUR, was, as at Ephesus, placed in the middle.

Session I.,
Oct. 8,
A.D. 451.

The first session took place on the eighth of October. It was opened by a protest on the part of the legates, that Dioscorus ought not to be admitted to the Council. By the order of the magistrates, the accused Bishop left his place, and seated himself as defendant in the midst of the assembly. Eusebius of Dorylæum advancing as plaintiff, conjured the Fathers that the memorial which he had drawn up might be read; in it he charged Dioscorus with having violated the Faith of Nicæa, condemned himself and Flavian unjustly, and supported the heresy of Eutyches: it concluded with a demand that the Acts of the Pseudo-Council of Ephesus might be read. Dioscorus at first agreed in this demand; but instantly after urged the previous discussion of the question of Faith. The magistrates, however, decided that the Acts should be read: they were accordingly begun when Theodoret, by the command of the civil authority, took his place in the Council. His entrance gave the signal for an uproar. "Out with the Nestorian!" cried the Egyptian Prelates: "the Faith is violated: Theodoret is banished from the Council by the Canons: long life to the Empress! out with Theodoret, who anathematized Cyril!" "Out with Dioscorus!" shouted the Oriental Prelates: "out with the murderer! with the man who summoned the Counts! the man who made us sign a blank paper!" Theodoret stood firm in the midst, and demanded a patient hearing: the magistrates, having with difficulty appeased the tumult, decided that he should be received as a plaintiff: observing that this could in no way violate the rights of the Council. The tumult increased: the magistrates at length composed it by commenting on the want of Episcopal dignity which it involved: and the acts of the Pseudo-Council were read, though not without many interruptions. The Prelates who had signed the deposition of Flavian protested that they had done so through fear: Stephen of Ephesus in particular stated, that the number of soldiers and monks employed in intimidating the assembly was about three hundred¹: and that he had not been

¹ This seems to be at variance with what other historians say of the thousand monks of Barsumas. But we may

imagine three hundred persons only to have entered the church, the others remaining outside.

allowed to leave the church, until he subscribed a sheet of blank paper, afterwards attached to the sentence of deposition. All bore witness to the violence of the conduct of Dioscorus; to his refusal to hear the letters of Leo; to the effacing the true Acts of the Council, by breaking the tablets of the notaries of some of the Catholic Bishops. Dioscorus taunted his accusers with their confession of having done through terror that which their conscience disapproved. The Orientals three times confessed their fault, and begged for pardon.

It must be confessed, that however grievous had been the fault, and unwarrantable—even had it been exercised for the Truth—the conduct of Dioscorus, he deserves at least the credit of great courage and presence of mind, and of not having been wanting to himself in his great extremity. During the whole time consumed in the reading of the Acts, he defended himself in every defensible action, put the fairest gloss on his violent demeanour, and turned the confession of his adversaries to the best account. Each succeeding step, however, only served the more clearly to expose his guilt: the creed of Flavian, as exposed in the Council of Ephesus, was found perfectly orthodox, and in conformity with that of S. Cyril; and towards the conclusion of the session, Juvenal of Jerusalem passed over to the side of the Catholic Prelates, amidst loud acclamations: Peter of Corinth followed his example, and was received with shouts of *Peter holds the Faith of Peter*: and he was imitated by the Bishops of Macedonia, and even by some of Egypt. Dioscorus, reduced to despair, exclaimed, “They are condemning the Fathers as well as me; I have passages from Athanasius and from Cyril which forbid us to speak of Two Natures after the Incarnation.” The Acts of Ephesus were continued: Dioscorus, knowing that the conclusion of that Synod would tell more fearfully against him than anything else, remarked that, as it was growing dark, it would be better to postpone the conclusion to another time: the magistrates would not consent; and the Acts were concluded by torch-light.

When they were finished, the Oriental Prelates cried out as one man, “Anathema to Dioscorus! Let the deposer be deposed! Long life to Leo! long life to the Patriarch!” The magistrates announced that the question of the Faith would be

Dioscorus
and his par-
tizans
deposed.

examined in another session : and proceed to pronounce sentence to the following effect : That as from the Acts of the Council of Ephesus it appeared that Flavian of blessed memory, and the holy Bishop Eusebius, had been unjustly deposed, it appeared good to themselves, as well-pleasing to God, if the Emperor consented, that Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and the Bishops of Cæsarea, Ancyra, Berytus, and Seleucia, should, as presidents or chief movers of that Council, undergo the same penalty, and be deprived, according to the Canons, of Episcopal dignity. It seems to have been understood, that the deprivation of the five latter Bishops would only, in case of acknowledgment of their fault, be inflicted *pro formâ*. The first Session terminated by the reiterated confession of their fault by the Bishops of Illyria, and a confused outburst of exclamations. "Long years to the Senate!" "Holy God, Holy and Mighty, Holy and Immortal, have mercy on us!" "Long years to the Emperor and Empress!" "CHRIST hath deposed Dioscorus!" "CHRIST hath deposed the homicide!" "God hath vindicated His Martyrs!"

Session II.,
Oct. 10.

At the beginning of the Second, which was held two days afterwards, the question of faith was debated. The creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople were first read,—then the letters of S. Cyril to Nestorius and to John of Antioch : and at the end of each, the Fathers professed their entire acquiescence in its doctrines. After these preliminaries, a Greek Translation of the famous letter of S. Leo to S. Flavian was read, and some exceptions were made to the passages where it states, in strong terms, the doctrine of Two Natures. The parts which gave offence were in the third and fourth sections.¹

Tome of S.
Leo read.

The orthodoxy of these disputed passages was proved by a reference to the works of S. Cyril, in the first two instances by Actius, Archdeacon of Constantinople ; and in the third by Theodoret. At the conclusion of the letter, the Fathers exclaimed, "It is the faith of the Apostles! our Creed is the same! Anathema to them that gainsay! S. Peter hath spoken

¹ *Ante*, p. 284. "To pay the debt of our condition," down to "might not be able to die from the other": p. 285, *ad fin.* "For each form," down

to p. 286, "the other yields to injuries": and p. 287, "For, albeit" down to "equal with the Father."

by Leo!" Some of the more cautious Prelates, however, requested time for the more careful comparison of this letter with other writings of the Fathers, and in particular with the Twelve Anathemas of S. Cyril: and five days were allowed for this purpose, Anatolius having it in charge to hold public meetings, for the further explanation of Leo's sentiments, and the clearing up any difficulty which might occur to the minds of the more scrupulous or less-informed among the Bishops. The Session ended in confusion. The Eutychianizing party shouted, "The Fathers to the Synod!" "Dioscorus to the Council!" "Dioscorus to the churches!"—Their opponents were equally ready with "Dioscorus to exile!" "The Egyptian to exile!" "He that communicates with Dioscorus is a Jew!"—Order having been restored by the magistrates, the Session terminated.

The third Session was held three days later: the five days fixed by the magistrates having nothing to do with the judgment of Dioscorus, which was now to come on, but only with the pure question of Faith. The magistrates were not present: and Dioscorus absented himself. Actius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, opened the Session by informing the Council that Eusebius of Dorylæum had drawn up a memorial, which he requested might be read. In it he represented the great violence which had been done both to the Canons and to justice, in the deposition of himself and of Flavian, and petitioned the Council that the punishment inflicted on Dioscorus might be signal, to serve as a warning to future offenders. Dioscorus was ordered to attend: Actius informed the Council that he had already been advertised of its Session, and had promised to come, if his guards would allow him. On this, search was made for him outside the Church, but to no purpose. He was then canonically cited a first time by three Bishops, and refused to come; firstly, on the ground that the guards would not permit him, and secondly, that the magistrates were not present at the Session, as they ought to be, he said, in order that the accusations against him might be fairly examined. A second citation was met by the same excuse, joined to which was a plea of illness. He further inquired if Juvenal and the other deposed Bishops were assisting at the Council: the deputies replied, that on this point they were not instructed to answer.

Session III.,
Oct. 13.

Dioscorus
cited a first,

and second
time.

His accusers
heard.

The Council being acquainted with these proceedings, received, in the next place, a deputation of clerks and of laics from Alexandria, charged with several memorials against Dioscorus. The accusations brought against him were of a very serious character: they included wanton destruction of property, homicide, wilful misappropriation of the Church's goods to his own pleasures, overbearing and cruel conduct to his Priests, and, lastly, an openly licentious life. Nor did the executors of S. Cyril fail to bring forward the hardships and injustice they had suffered at his hands.

Dioscorus
cited a third
time,

Dioscorus was then, for the third and last time, summoned to appear: the citation was in writing: and bore in addition, that if the defendant did not appear, he would be condemned as contumacious. Dioscorus replied, that he had nothing to add to what he had already said, and repeated this answer seven times. On the commissioners' report, the legates pronounced sentence to the following effect: That whereas Dioscorus had been guilty of various excesses, clearly proved to the Council: had admitted to his Communion Eutyches, deprived by his Bishop: had persisted in defending, instead of asking pardon for, his conduct at Ephesus; had excommunicated Pope Leo; and being duly cited thrice, had refused to appear and answer for his misdeeds; therefore the Most Holy Archbishop of Rome, with the Apostle S. Peter, by the Legates, and the assembled Council, adjudged him to be deprived of all Episcopal Dignity, and the sacerdotal office. This sentence was subscribed by the Legates, the Patriarchal Thrones, and the Bishops in order: and with it terminated the third Session of the Council of Chalcedon.

and deposed.

END OF VOL. I.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME I.

	Page.
Abilius, S., Patriarch	13
Abreha and Atzbeha, SS.	155
Achillas, S., Patriarch	113
Æmilian assumes the purple at Alexandria	77
Æra of Martyrs	89
Agrippinus, S., Patriarch	15
Alexander, S., Patriarch	115
encyclic epistle of, against Arius	126
his Tome	129
his death	151
writes to S. Alexander of Byzantium	130
Alexandria, Church of, founded by S. Mark	3
the Third See	209
Great Plague at	78
Council of	173
Council of	193
Council of, against Arius	117
Second ditto	119
Third ditto	135
Arian persecution at	186
Ambrose, the friend of Origen	26
Anastasius teaches that S. Mary is not Theotocos	235
Anathemas, the Twelve, of S. Cyril	251
Andronicus excommunicated by Synesius	224
Anomœans, their rise	189
Anianus, S., his conversion	6
he succeeds S. Mark	13
Antony, S., his birth	107
he embraces the solitary life	108
his temptations	109
in the Castle	109

	Page.
Antony, S., his disciples	111
visits S. Paul	177
his death	187
Antioch, Great Schism at	205
Council of	175
Apollonia, S., her Martyrdom	42
Apollonius, S., his Martyrdom	91
Apostates, reception of	50
Arabic Canons of Nicæa	149
Arcaph, John, the Meletian	161
Arianism, causes of its rapid rise	120
Arius joins Meletius	92
elevated to the Priesthood	114
rise of his heresy	116
he is anathematised	120
in Palestine	124
his death	170
Arsenius, Bishop of Hypsele, his pretended murder	161
Asclas, S., his Martyrdom	94
Athanasius, S., his education	118
Patriarch	152
his canonical election	153
visits his Diocese	157
is threatened by Eusebius	158
he goes to Tyre	163
is accused of fornication	164
is acquitted	165
produces Arsenius	165
deposed	167
goes to Constantinople	168
is banished	169
at Treves	170
returns to Alexandria	172
goes to Rome	174
returns to Alexandria	175
goes again to Rome	175
is recalled	182
goes to Antioch	183
to Alexandria	183
goes into the desert	188
his letter to the Monks	190
returns to Alexandria	192
again exiled	195
returns	196
again exiled	197
returns	198
death of	200
Athenagoras	18
Axum, Metropolis of Ethiopia	156

	Page.
Basileides, S., his Martyrdom	22
Basil, S., his opinion of S. Dionysius	75
Besas, S.,	44
Bithynia, Pseudo Council of	128
Brothers, the Long, at Constantinople	219
Bull, Bishop, defends S. Dionysius	81
 Cæsarea, Council of	 162
Candidian protests against the Council of Ephesus	259
Caracalla, his orders for a massacre at Alexandria	24
Cassian in Egypt	229
writes on the Incarnation	250
Catechetical School, of Alexandria	19
Celadion, S., Patriarch	15
Celestine, Pope, S., applied to by Nestorius	247
condemns Nestorius	250
Cerdo, S., Patriarch	13
Chalcedon, Council of, Fourth Œcumenical	299
Clement of Alexandria	19
Coluthus, his schism	116
he recants	135
Coluthium, in the Mareotis	67
Confessors in the Decian persecution	46
Constantine, Emperor	133
his letters to Alexander and Arius	134
Constantine, his death	171
Constantinople, Council of, Second Œcumenical	208
Council of Alexandria against Origen	28
Creed of Eusebius	143
Nicaea	145
Cronion, S.	44
Cyrilla, S., her Martyrdom	103
Cyril, S., his early studies	226
his election	225
attacks Novatians	226
quarrels with Orestes	227
received to Communion with Rome	228
attacks Nestorianism in his XVII. Paschal Epistle	237
his first letter to Nestorius	246
his second letter	248
his third letter	251
goes to Ephesus	256
imprisoned	268
returns to Alexandria	270
negotiations with John of Antioch	271
is reconciled with him	273
dies	275
Cyrus and John, SS., their Martyrdom	112

	Page.
Decius, his persecution	43
Demetrius, S., Patriarch	16
remonstrates with Alexander	27
his death	29
Didymus, S.	95
his vision	196
Diocletian, commencement of his persecution	93
he abdicates	97
Dionysia, S.	45
Dionysius, S., Patriarch	39
his polemical powers	40
leaves Alexandria	43
writes to Origen on Martyrdom	47
confesses before Æmilian	65
attacked by Germanus	67
accused of Arianism to Dionysius of Rome	72
condemned in Council	72
composes an apology	73
acquitted	75
his letter to Paul of Samosata not genuine	82
his death	83
Dioscorus, S., his confession	41
Dioscorus, Patriarch	278
his immorality	279
his violence	280
presides at Ephesus	290
is deposed	304
Donatus, S., and his companions, their Martyrdom	133
Ephesus, Council of, Third Œcumenical	256
First Session	260
Second Session	264
Third and Fourth Session	265
Robbers' Meeting at	290
Epiphanius, S., assists Theophilus against S. Chrysostom	220
Eumenius, S., Patriarch	14
Eusebius, Christian charity of	77
Eusebius of Nicomedia, his character	123
his intrigues at Nicæa	143
deposes S. Eustathius	159
Eusebius of Dorylæum attacks Nestorius	238
Eustathius, S., of Antioch	139
Eutychius, his account of the twelve Presbyters	9
Eutyches, rise of his heresy	280
Evangelical See, a title of Alexandria	5
Fabius of Antioch	54
Flavian, S., of Constantinople, condemns Eutyches	280
is condemned	297

Flavian, S., is murdered	Page.
Frumentius, S., goes into Ethiopia	298
is appointed Metran	154
George, Arian Bishop of Alexandria	188
he is murdered	192
Gregory of Cappadocia, Arian Bishop of Alexandria	175
his outrages	176
Heracclas, S., is associated with Origen	23
Patriarch	30
Hexapla, the	31
Hilarion, S.	178
Homousion, the, proposed	144
Hosius goes to Alexandria	134
Hypatia, her murder	228
Hypostases, Question of One or Three	194
Irene, the courtezan	279
Isidore of Scete, S.	111
" "	179
Ischyrras, his history	159
Jerome, S., his account of the twelve Presbyters	10
John of Antioch expected at Ephesus	257
deposes S. Cyril	264
Julian, S., Patriarch	15
his Martyrdom	44
Julian the Apostate, Emperor	191
Julius, Pope, S., his reception of S. Athanasius	180
his negociations with the Eusebians	181
Justus, S., Patriarch	14
Kefro, Desert of	66
Leo, S., writes to Dioscorus	279
his celebrated Letter to S. Flavian	281
opposes the convocation of an Œcumenical Council	298
Leonidas, S., his Martyrdom	19
Licinius, his persecution	132
Lucius, Arian Bishop of Alexandria	201
persecutes the Catholics	202
Macar, S.	45
Macarius, S.	111
Marcian, S., Patriarch	15
Marcian, Emperor	298
Marius Mercator	232
Mareotis, Commission of Inquiry in	66
Mark, S., goes to Egypt	6

	Page.
Mark, S., goes to Rome	7
his Martyrdom	8
Maximus, S., Patriarch	85
Maximin, his persecution	31
Melania, S., in Egypt	205
Melas, S., of Rhinocorura	202
Meletian schism, rise of	91
Meletius condemned	146
Metras, S., his Martyrdom	41
Moyse, Bishop of the Saracens	205
Mysticism, tendency of Alexandria to	37
 Nestorius, his early life	 234
he is consecrated Patriarch of Constantinople	235
origin of his heresy	236
replies to S. Proclus	242
his first letter to S. Cyril	246
his second	248
admonished	251
condemned	261
his miserable death	277
Nicæa, Council of	137
Nile-gauge removed from the Temple of Serapis	213
Novatian, his schism	48
is joined by the Confessors	49
answered by S. Dionysius	51
Nubia, Church of, its origin doubtful	157
 Oak, Synod of the	 222
Orestes attacked by S. Cyril	228
Origenian controversy	216
Origen, his birth	18
his education	18
succeeds to Alexandrian school	20
his mistaken zeal	22
he goes to Rome	23
visits Arabia	24
his misunderstanding with Demetrius	25
ordained Priest	27
condemned	28
his orthodoxy and errors	33
Oxyrinchus, City of, its holiness	230
 Paganism destroyed in Egypt	 214
Palestine, Martyrs in	102
Pambo, S.	179
Pantænus, S.	18
goes to India	20

	Page.
Paphnutius, S.	147
Paschal letters, their origin	67
Paschal Cycle of S. Dionysius	68
Paulinus, Bishop of the High Catholic party at Antioch	193
Paul the Simple, S.	177
Paul, S., the first hermit	48
his death	177
Paul of Samosata, his heresy	81
Peter, S., Patriarch, his birth	90
his penitential Canons	98
his Martyrdom	105
Peter, S., his Martyrdom	113
Peter II., Patriarch	200
goes to Rome	203
recalled	206
consecrates Maximus	206
dies	207
not reckoned among the Saints	207
Phileas, S., his exhortation on Martyrdom	57
his Martyrdom	98
Philip, Augustal prefect	16
his Martyrdom	17
Philumenus aspires to the empire	159
Philemon, S., his Martyrdom	95
Pisper, Mount	110
Pistus, Arian Bishop of Alexandria	173
Potamiæna, S., her Martyrdom	21
Primus, S., Patriarch	14
Proclus, S., a candidate for the Throne of Constantinople	233
preaches on the Incarnation	239
Quinta, S., her Martyrdom	41
Rimini, Council of	190
Sabellian heresy, its rise	69
Sardica, Council of	181
Selden, his Commentary on Eusebius	10
Seleucia, Council of	190
Serapion, S., his Martyrdom	42
Serapis, Temple of, its destruction	211
Severus, persecution of	17
Sheba, Queen of, founds the Salomonean Dynasty	155
Siderius, Bishop of Palcbisea	198
Simon the Canaanite, S., preaches the Gospel in Egypt	5
Socrates, legend of	103
Synesius, Bishop of Ptolemais	223

	Page.
Theodoret supports Nestorius	254
Thalia, the, of Arius	128
Theodora, S.	95
Theonas, S., Patriarch	85
his Epistle to Lucian	86
his death	88
Theonas, Meletian Bishop	153
Theophilus, Patriarch	210
destroys the Temple of Serapis	213
goes to Constantinople	215
consecrates S. John Chrysostom	215
attacks the Anthropomorphites	217
his cruelty to Isidore	218
goes to Constantinople	220
deposes S. Chrysostom	221
flies for his life	223
his death	225
Therapeutæ, the	5
Timothy, Patriarch	208
goes to Constantinople	209
dies	210
Tyre, Council of	163
Valens, persecution of	197
Valerian, his persecution	65
his death	76

INDEX

TO

VOLUME II.

	Page.
Aaron-al Raschid	184
Aba Hamoul of Wissim, confession of	57
Abbot, Archbishop, his first letter to Cyril Lucar	387
Abdel-Aziz persecutes the Jacobites	79
“ “ “	83
Abdel Messiah, Patriarch	175
<i>Abdel Messiah, Patriarch</i>	213
his Canons	213
he is thrown into prison	219
Abunegiah, Martyrdom of	202
Abubeker, Caliph	69
Acephali	10
the greater part join the Jacobites	29
Ælurus, see Timothy the Cat	12
<i>Agatho, Patriarch</i>	78
Abbasidæ, Rise of	114
<i>Alexander, Patriarch</i>	90
carried through the country to obtain a ransom	92
visits his diocese	95
dies	97
Alexander II. Patriarch	210
Alexandria taken by Cosroes	60
Capture of, by the Saracens	72
Catholic See of, Vacant for seventy years	75
restored	107
Sack of, by the Spaniards	140
Capture of, by Peter of Cyprus	330
Alfter, Patriarch	270
Ali, religious disputes with respect to	119
Almamon, Caliph	113
Amru enters Egypt	71
Antioch, schism with the Jacobite See of	120
<i>Anastasius Apozygiarius, Patriarch</i>	50
<i>Andronicus, Patriarch</i>	55
Apollinarius, attempt of	33
Apollinaris, Patriarch	41
Apostacy, Canons concerning	216
Apostacy, general	329
Arabia, state of, at era of Mahomet	67

	Page.
Armenians, toleration of their Schism by the Jacobites	246
Arsenian schism	311
Arsenius, Patriarch	198
Asabah, sacrilege and death of	91
<i>Athanasius, Patriarch</i>	24
Athanasius III., Patriarch	310
his negotiations with the Arsenians for the reunion	315
his adventures in Greece	321
Athanasius IV., Patriarch	308
Aziz, Sultan	272
Baldwin, King of Jerusalem, in Egypt	239
Barreto, Nuno, Latin Patriarch	353
Barsanuphians, their reunion with the Jacobites	137
Basiliscus the Emperor, his circular letter	16
Beccus, Patriarch of Constantinople	319
<i>Benjamin, Patriarch</i>	61
receives a letter of safety from Amru	73
<i>Benjamin II., Patriarch</i>	327
Bermudez, Latin Patriarch	347
Bethlehem, Council of	464
Bogomili, heresy of the	241
Bondocdar, Sultan	315
Brzesc, Council of	361
Cairo, Council of, against Cyril-ben-laklak	302
Cairo, Council of, against Rome	384
Caliphate, decline of the	161
Cat, Timothy the	12
<i>Chail I., Patriarch</i>	111
imminent danger and courage of	115
he is put to the torture	116
pronounces the prayer of absolution	117
is set at liberty	117
his firmness	121
dies	122
Chail I., Patriarch	157
<i>Chail II., Patriarch</i>	154
Chail II., Patriarch	164
his crimes	236
<i>Chail III., Patriarch</i>	169
he deposes the Bishop of Saka	170
is thrown into prison	170
raises money by Simony	171
dies	174
<i>Chail IV., Patriarch</i>	231
<i>Chail V., Patriarch</i>	249
<i>Chail VI., Patriarch</i>	340
<i>Chenouda I., Patriarch</i>	157
he is accused of heresy	159

	Page.
<i>Chenouda I.</i> , retires into the country	160
is committed to prison	164
dies	169
<i>Chenouda II.</i> , <i>Patriarch</i>	208
his perjury	209
and Simony	210
Chiracou, General in Egypt	253
Christopher, <i>Patriarch</i>	138
Claudius, Emperor	349
his defeat and death	354
Confessional Controversy, rise of	261
Constantinople, false Council of, against Images	127
Constantinople, Council of, sixth Œcumenical	80
Corrupticolæ, their origin	30
<i>Cosmas I.</i> , <i>Patriarch</i>	97
a prisoner	113
Cosmas I., <i>Patriarch</i>	108
goes to Damascus	109
<i>Cosmas II.</i> , <i>Patriarch</i>	155
<i>Cosmas III.</i> , <i>Patriarch</i>	177
Cosroes, conquests of	63
takes Alexandria	60
defeated by Heraclius	60
Covilhãa in Ethiopia	339
Crete, state of, in the sixteenth century	357
Crusade, the first	333
<i>Cyril II.</i> , <i>Patriarch</i>	222
Canons of	228
Cyril II., <i>Patriarch</i>	238
<i>Cyril-ben-laklak</i> , <i>Patriarch</i>	297
his Crimes	299
he ordains a Bishop for Jerusalem	300
imprisoned	302
his Canons	304
wretched death	305
Cyril Lucar, his birth	356
goes to Alexandria	358
ordained Priest	361
legate in Poland	363
becomes acquainted with Von Haga	364
goes to Constantinople	365
begins to embrace Protestant tenets	366
corresponds with Uytenbogaert	367
goes to Wallachia	369
progress of his apostasy	369
at the Holy Mountain	383
anathematizes the Roman Missionaries	384
his first Letter to Abbot	385
to de Dominis	390

	Page.
Cyril Lucar, his intimacy with Le Leu Wilhem	401
shuts himself up during the great Plague at Cairo	403
Patriarch of Constantinople	404
attacks the Jesuits	410
banished to Rhodes	414
recalled	417
his confession	424
his friendship with M. Leger	431
his interview with De Marchville	439
banished to Rhodes	442
restored	449
his murder	454
and character	455
Cyrus at Constantinople	71
Cyrus, Patriarch	62
his false union with the Jacobites	53
<i>Damianus, Patriarch</i>	45
Damietta, capture of, by John de Brienne	285
loss of	291
capture of, by S. Louis	307
loss of	309
<i>David of Fayoum</i> , his intrigues for the Patriarchate	282
defeated	283
he again intrigues	289
is again defeated	291
is successful, and takes the name of Cyril	297
Dionysius, Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch	145
<i>Dioscorus II.</i>	29
Dositheans, condemned by S. Eulogius	47
Dunaan, persecution of	31
Ecthesis, the	70
Egypt, invasion of, by the Spanish Omniadæ	139
Election of Jacobite Patriarchs, method of	99
Elesbaan, Saint, defeats Dunaan	32
his character	32
Elias, Patriarch	271
" "	190
Elmacinus, character of his history	242
England, conversion of	49
<i>Ephraim, Patriarch</i>	190
murder of	192
Ethiopia, attempt to increase the number of Sees in	247
Eulogius, S., Patriarch	46
condemns the Dositheans	47
corresponds with S. Gregory	49
his death	51
Eulogius II., Patriarch	240
Eustathius, Patriarch	136

Eutychians, difference between, and Monophysites	8
Eutychius, Patriarch	181
his writings	182
his disputes with his people	184
Famine, a horrible	220
Fatimidæ, rise of the	188
they conquer Egypt	189
fall of the	252
Florence, Council of	335
Francis, S., in Egypt	286
<i>Gabriel I., Patriarch</i>	175
his exactions	176
<i>Gabriel II., Patriarch</i>	243
his Canons	248
<i>Gabriel VI., Patriarch</i>	340
<i>Gabriel VII., Patriarch</i>	354
<i>Gaianus, Anti-Patriarch</i>	34
Gaianites, rebaptized by the Jacobites	95
Gama, Christopher de, his expedition	349
his death	351
George, Patriarch	60
“ “	204
Gerasimus Spartaliotes, Patriarch	404
his firmness	431
Gregory I., Patriarch	297
Gregory II., Patriarch	326
Gregory III., Patriarch	327
Gregory IV., Patriarch	331
Gregory V., Patriarch	347
Gregory S., of Antioch, falsely accused	48
Gragne, death of	352
Hakem, his superstition	200
his madness	200
he is adored as a divinity	200
Hamarowia, Emir	172
marries his daughter to the Caliph	173
is murdered	174
Heikeliet, the	101
Helena, Regent of Ethiopia	340
Homeritæ, church of the	31
embrace Nestorianism	75
Honorius, Pope, anathematized	81
Iconoclastic Controversy	124
<i>Isaac, Patriarch</i>	81
his death	83
Isaac, Patriarch	187

	Page.
<i>Jacob I., Patriarch</i>	142
Jacobites, their various Sects	10
origin of the name	33
James the Just, of Aragon	323
Jeremiah S., Martyrdom of	203
Joachim, Patriarch	347
Job, Patriarch	187
John Talaia, Patriarch	19
he is banished	21
vain endeavours for his restoration	21
<i>John I., Patriarch</i>	25
John I., Patriarch	44
<i>John II., Patriarch</i>	26
John, S. the Almoner, Patriarch	52
his almsdeeds	53
his justice	56
anecdotes of	57
he leaves Alexandria	58
his death	59
<i>John III., Semnudaus, Patriarch</i>	78
he dies	81
John of Nicius, deposed for cruelty	85
John III., Patriarch	219
<i>John IV., Patriarch</i>	129
<i>John V., Patriarch</i>	249
<i>John VI., Patriarch</i>	270
<i>John VII., Patriarch</i>	313
<i>John VIII., Patriarch</i>	322
<i>John IX., Patriarch</i>	327
<i>John X., Patriarch</i>	329
<i>John XI., Patriarch</i>	336
<i>John XII., Patriarch</i>	347
<i>John XIII., Patriarch</i>	347
Kahad, martyrdom of	203
Kamel, Sultan	284
his justice	295
Kilus, Abuna of Axum	276
his imposition	277
his degradation	277
Korban, form of	204
Lalibala, <i>Saint</i>	278
Le Leu Wilhem, his intimacy with Cyril Lucar	401
Leger, M., his friendship with Cyril Lucar	481
Leontius, Patriarch	210
Louis, S., in Egypt	307
Lyons, Council of	316
Macarius of Antioch condemned	81

	Page.
<i>Macarius, Patriarch</i>	183
<i>Macarius II., Patriarch</i>	237
Maffudi, defeat and death of	345
Mahometanism, rise of	67
Makrizi, character of his history	333
Malabar, deputation from, to Alexandria	88
Mamelukes, accession of	310
Marianus, commander of the Roman forces	71
Mark-ben-Kunbar maintains confession	262
is excommunicated	263
submits	263
joins the Catholics	265
recants	266
again joins them	266
dies	266
<i>Mark II., Patriarch</i>	136
charity of	189
Mark II., Patriarch	273
<i>Mark III., Patriarch</i>	270
Mark III., Patriarch	340
<i>Mark IV., Patriarch</i>	327
Marriage, heresy respecting	87
Married Patriarch, attempt to intrude one	147
Martin, Saint, confession of	77
Matthew, his mission to Portugal	343
his misfortunes	344
his honourable reception	345
Maximus, S., attacks the Monothelites	77
his death	77
Melchites, origin of the term	7
Melec Segued, Emperor	354
Meruan, the last of the Eastern Ommiadæ	117
his defeat and death	118
Metaxa, Nicolas, his arrival at Constantinople	423
his imminent danger	429
taken under the British protection	429
Metrophanes Critopulus, Patriarch	446
Metropolitans, creation of	160
Michael I., of Antioch, on Confession	264
<i>Minas I., Patriarch</i>	122
<i>Minas II., Patriarch</i>	187
Misra, Council of	87
origin of	89
Council of	121
Council of	226
Emirate, defects of the	76
Monophysites, difference between, and Eutychians	8
Monothelitism, rise of	63
decline of	76

	Page.
Moscow a Patriarchate	359
Moses of Wissim threatens Kacem	110
his firmness in persecution	112
“ “ “ “	115
Naod, Emperor	343
Nekam, his apostacy	215
his martyrdom	216
Nicæa, II. Council of (so called) VII. Œcumenical	131
Nicolas I., Patriarch	278
his correspondence with Innocent III.	279
his correspondence with Honorius	294
Nile, miracle said to have been wrought by <i>Chail I.</i>	119
Niphon, Patriarch	329
Nubia, its first ecclesiastical mention	82
Œcumenical Judge, origin of the appellation	204
Oil and salt, question of mingling in the oblations	214
Omar, Caliph	69
Ommiadæ, downfall of	114
Paul, Patriarch	35
his tyranny	38
and deposition	38
Persecution I. under Abdel-Aziz	83
II. under Asabah	90
III. under Abdallah	92
IV. under Korah and Theodore	95
V. under Asama	96
VI. under Hafiz	112
VII. under Mutewakel	155
VIII. under Abdallah	160
IX. under Ahmed	164
X. under Hakem	199
XI. under Nacer ben Kelaoun	322
XII.	328
<i>Peter Mongus, Patriarch</i>	17
he receives the Henoticon	21
he persecutes the Catholics	23
Peter, Catholic Legate in Trullo	85
Peter II., Patriarch	71
Peter, Metropolitan of Axum	178
he is made Regent of Ethiopia	178
he is banished	179
<i>Peter V., Patriarch</i>	327
Phantasiasts, origin of the name	30
Philotheus. See George	204
<i>Philotheus, Patriarch</i>	192
his crimes	196
his miserable death	198

	Page.
Philotheus, Patriarch	333
his negotiation for the reunion	335
his rejection of it	337
Piga, Meletius, goes to Alexandria	356
Patriarch	359
his correspondence with Sigismund III.	362
Politian, Patriarch	128
goes to Bagdad	136
Portuguese first visit Ethiopia	339
Prester, John, origin of the name	177
Proterius, Saint, his consecration	5
his correspondence with S. Leo	10
his martyrdom	12
Psoïus, murder of	38
Reformation, articles of, for Jacobites	303
Saada, Empress of Ethiopia	197
Sabas, Patriarch	228
Saladin, Vizir	255
Saladin, commencement of	269
Sultan	261
his virtues	268
his death	271
Schisms, the various, between the Jacobites of Alexandria and Antioch	28
Schism, the great, between the East and West	217
Seljukidæ, rise of the	231
Sendafa, apostacy of the Bishop of	305
Severus, Bishop of Aschumin, his works	191
Severus, Metropolitan of Axum	224
Silvester, Patriarch	356
Simon, Patriarch	83
his asceticism	84
his death	90
Simon II., Patriarch	146
Simony justified by a Council of Jacobite Bishops	211
Solar years, computation by, forbidden	238
Sophronius, Patriarch	146
Sophronius II.	185
Sophronius II., Patriarch	250
Tecla Haimanot founds the Monastic Life in Ethiopia	74
Theodore Scribo, Patriarch	51
his murder	52
Theodore, Patriarch	98
dies	109
Theodore Balsamon, applied to by Mark of Alexandria	273
Theodosians and Gaianites, false concordat between	43
Theodosius, Patriarch	33

	Page.
Theodosius, Patriarch	235
<i>Theodosius II., Patriarch</i>	321
<i>Theophanius, Patriarch</i>	186
he is seized with frenzy	186
and is put to death	187
Theophylactians, Catholics so called	86
Three Chapters condemned by Justinian	39
by the Fifth Œcumenical Council	41
Tiberias, battle of	269
Timothy the Cat sent into exile	14
goes to Constantinople	15
returns to Egypt	17
Timothy Saloaciolus, Patriarch	15
<i>Timothy II., Patriarch</i>	30
Treasure, discovery and misuse of	93
Tredda Gabez, Empress of Ethiopia	197
Trullo, Council in	85
Turks, a body-guard formed of, by the Caliphs	168
Two Grooms of the Chamber, church of	85
Type, the publication of	77
Uniates, rise of	361
Urban VIII., his interrogatories to Cyril Lucar	419
Uytendogaert, his correspondence with Cyril Lucar	366
Vasah, his early history	193
his conversion	194
his works	195
Vigilius goes to Constantinople	40
his vacillation	41
Vizir	255
Von Haga becomes acquainted with Cyril Lucar	364
Wilna, Council of	361
Wine, use of it forbidden to the Christians	156
Woggora, battle of	351
<i>Yuçab, Patriarch</i>	148
Yuçab is persecuted by the Caliph	153
Zacharias, King of Nubia, his negociations with the Caliph	150
<i>Zacharias, Patriarch</i>	199
he is exposed to lions	202
he dies	207

